THE KĀNYAKUBJA-GAUḌA STRUGGLE

from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century A. D.

(Dr. Biman Bihari Majumdar Memorial Lecture for the year 1982)

D. C. SIRCAR



THE ASIATIC SOCIETY
1, Park Street, Calcutta-700 016
1985

First Published in 1985

Published by :

Dr. Chandan Roy Chowdhury
General Secretary
The Asiatic Society,
1, Park Street, Calcutta-700 016.

Printed by :

Sm. Sushama Gayen,
Samaj Sevak Sangha Press, (Training-cum-Production)
Bidisha, P.O.-Fulgeria
Dist.-Midnapur, West Bengal.

Price : Rs. 30·00

Dedicated to the Memory of

INDIRA GANDHI

One of the Greatest Leaders the World ever produced

FOREWORD

The Asiatic Society feels extremely happy to bring out this learned monograph of Professor D. C. Sircar. Professor Sircar, one of the foremost Indologists in the world, delivered the Biman Behari Majumdar Lectures of 1982. The present volume is an outcome of that series of lectures.

The subject of the monograph is of immense historical importance and interest. The complexities of the Tripartite-Struggle have been a subject of intensive historical research for many years. Eminent historians have written on this topic. Yet, many problems have remained unsolved. Vital data have been missing. Professor Sircar has exhaustively discussed with his usual thoroughness and analytical mind the different aspects of the long drawn struggle for political hegemony in Northern India. The result has been most rewarding for all researchers and students of Indian history of this period. So far, scholars had primarily concentrated on the tussle among the Pālas, Pratihāras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. By including and throwing new light on such aspects as the importance of the Āyudhas, the problem of the Harṣa Era, and the relations among the Gāhaḍavālas, the Pālas and the Senas, Professor Sircar has added a new dimension to the study of the subject.

One of the major purposes of the Asiatic Society is to publish works of exacting academic standard. We are grateful to Professor Sircar for giving us an opportunity of publishing such a monograph. We are also grateful to him for undertaking the responsibility of supervising the printing-work of the book himself. But unfortuately his repeated illness and sad and sudden demise on January 10, 1985, did not allow him to see it entirely through the press. A member of our Publication Committee Dr. Samaresh Bandyopadhyay has supervised the printing-work of the remaining part of the book. Our sincere thanks are due to Dr. Bandyopadhyay.

Professor D. C. Sircar's monograph, I am sure, will be widely appreciated by scholars in the field and by his peers.

The Asiatic Society,
1, Park Street,
Calcutta-700016.
January 22, 1985.

Dr. Chandan Ray Chaudhuri
General Secretary

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

While publishing the results of my study of the Dubi plates of king Bhāskaravarman (c. 600-50 A.D.) of Kāmarūpa with particular reference to the light thrown by the inscription on the struggle between Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa in the sixth and seventh centuries A. D., I drew attention, more than thirty years ago, to a theory of the ancient Indian politicians and its bearing on the various states rising out of the ruins of the Gupta empire. It was believed that a king (say A) has his natural enemy in the neighbouring ruler (say B) while the ruler (say C) of the territory beyond that of the enemy king (i.e., B) was a natural enemy of his immediate neighbour but a natural friend of the distant neighbour (i.e., A) ; and so on. On the fall of the Gupta empire, about the Gupta year 231 (550-51 A. D.) according to a Jain tradition, their Maukhari feudatories, who became independent at Kanauj (ancient Kānyakubja, Kanyākubja, Kanyakubja, etc.), were enemies of their eastern neighbours, the Gauḍas of Bengal, as well as of their south-western neighbours, the Later Guptas of Mālava (i.e. East Malwa). The Gauḍas, on the other hand, were not only the enemies of their western neighbours, the Maukharis, but also of their north-eastern neighbours, the Bhauma-Nārakas of Kāmarūpa (Assam), and at the same time, they were friends of the Later Gupta enemies of the Maukharis. It seems that the Maukharis and Bhauma-Nārakas were friends of each other because they were both enemies of the Gauḍas. The Later Guptas were originally friends of the Puṣyabhūtis of Thanesar ; but this relationship was disturbed about the beginning of the seventh century A. D., so that the Puṣyabhūtis allied themselves with the Maukharis. In this case, a so-called 'natural enemy' became a friend on the change of circumstances.

While the Gauḍas were succeeded in Bengal and Bihar by the Pālas and Senas (eighth to thirteenth century), the kingdom of Kānyakubja or Kanauj (Kanoj) passed from the Maukharis first to the Puṣyabhūti king Harṣa (seventh century), next to the Maurya house of Yaśovarman (eighth century) and then to the Āyudhas (eighth-ninth century), Gurjara-Pratihāras (ninth to eleventh century) and Gāhaḍavālas (eleventh-twelfth century), but

the Kānyakubja-Gauḍa struggle continued throughout the centuries. The latest event associated with the struggle is the Sena claim to have raised pillars of victory at Vārāṇasī and Prayāga in the dominions of the Gāhaḍavālas as found in the records of Lakṣmaṇasena's successors who ruled in the eastern areas of Bengal in the thirteenth century A. D. However, the Sena-Gāhaḍavāla struggle must have ended sometime before the Turkish Musalman occupation of the western part of Lakṣmaṇasena's empire, the date of the Muslim conquest of Gauḍa being known from the gold Ṭaṅka issued by Ikhtiyāruddīn Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār Khaljī in the name of Muizuddīn Muḥammad bin Sām to have been the 19th Ramazān in the Hijrī year 601 which corresponds to the 10th May, 1205 A. D. As a matter of fact, the Gāhaḍavālas had been subdued by the Turkish Musalmans more than a decade earlier, so that the struggle could not have continued beyond the twelfth century A.D. However, strained relationship between Western Uttar Pradesh region and Bengal has been traced even in the mediæval and modern times as well.

The history of the Gauḍa-Kānyakubja struggle is of considerable importance since certain wrong theories have been propounded by historians without having a clear idea about it. One such belief is that the three great powers, viz. the Pālas, Gurjara-Pratihāras and Rāṣṭrakūṭas, were struggling for the supremacy of North India or for the occupation of Kanauj ; but we have tried here to show that neither did the above powers fight with a singular purpose nor had Kanoj acquired a halo of imperialism and was coveted by adventurers as a result thereof before the middle of the ninth century A. D. While the Pratihāra-Rāṣṭrakūṭa struggle began far away from Kanauj, it became one of the greatest cities of India only under the two centuries of Gurjara-Pratihāra rule. We have also tried to show how the great extent of the Āyudha kingdom has so far remained unrealised by our historians.

When sometime ago I was invited by the General Secretary of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, to deliver the Dr. B B. Majumdar Memorial Lectures for the year 1982, I readily agreed to do so because the late Dr. Majumdar was not only a reputed student of history and political science, but also a valued and respected friend of mine, and it was impossible for me to ignore the oppor-

tunity offered to me to pay homage to the memory of my late lamented friend.

In April, 1978, I delivered some lectures at the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology of the University of Allahabad as a Visiting Professor there. A few of the topics discussed in the present series were touched in one or two of the lectures delivered on that occasion.

645 New Alipore,
Calcutta—700 053.
February 14, 1983.

D. C. SIRCAR

CHAPTER ONE

THE COUNTRY OF PAÑCĀLA AND THE CITY OF KĀNYAKUBJA

According to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*,[1] Pañcāla is the later name of the Krivi tribe of the *Ṛgveda* which places the people on the bank of the Sindhu.[2] The Pañcāla people are supposed by scholars to have absorbed several other tribes as well.[3] In later Vedic literature,[4] the close associates of the Kurus are sometimes mentioned as Pañcāla though the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[5] places in a similar position the Sṛñjayas known already from the *Ṛgveda*.[6] Soerensen has pointed out that, in the *Mahābhārata*, the Sṛñjayas are mentioned sometimes as a tribe or family among the Pañcālas, the two names being often used as synonymous though sometimes they are also found in the same context side by side.[7] According to the *Mahābhārata* tradition, the Pañcāla country covering wide areas of modern Uttar Pradesh was divided into two parts, viz, North and South, North Pañcāla having its capital at Ahicchatra which is modern Ramnagar in the Bareilly District with the capital of South Pañcāla at Kāmpīlya, modern Kampil in the Farrukha-

---

1 XIII. 5 4. 7.
2 VIII. 20. 24 ; 22. 12.
3 *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, P. 469.
4 Cf. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII. 14.
5 II. 4. 4. 5.
6 VI. 27. 7 ; IV. 15. 4.
7 *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata*, p. 649.

bad District.[1] This Kāmpīlya is identified by some scholars with Kāmpila mentioned in various other early texts, such as the *Yajurveda*,[2] though it is not definitely known that the Pañcāla people were already settled in the region in question during the later Saṁhitā period.

The country of the Pañcālas, later often called Pāñcāla, comprising the Bareilly area in the north and the Farrukhabad region in the south, lost its ancient name in the medieval period so much so that the late medieval work entitled *Ṣaṭpañcāśaddeśavibhāga* forming a part of the *Śaktisaṅgamatantra*, the composition of which is assignable to the 18th century, does not exhibit any knowledge of the old Pañcāla-Pāñcāla country but speaks of an altogether different territory known by the old name. Thus it has as many as three interesting passages,[3] viz., verses 23,[4] 24[5] and 48,[6] throwing light on the location of the country in question.

---

1 According to the story of the struggle between Droṇa and Drupada, the former defeated the latter who was driven out of Ahicchatra in North Pañcāla and became the king only of South Pañcāla lying to the south of the Ganges and having the cities of Kāmpīlya and Mākandī See *Mahābhārata*, VII. 163.

2 See *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, VII. 4. 19. 1 ; *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*, III. 12. 20 ; *Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā*, Aśvamedha, IV. 3 ; *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, XXIII. 8 ; cf. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, III. 9. 6 ; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XIII. 2. 8. 3.

3 Sircar, *Stud. Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.*, 1971, pp. 83, 86 ; cf. pp. 200ff. *Daśa-tri-yojan-ottaram* is a variant reading in verse 23.

4 *Kurukṣetrāt paścime tu tathā c=ottara bhāgataḥ /*
Indraprasthān=Maheśāni daśa-tri-yojan-āntaram //
Pāñcāla-deśo Deveśi saundarya-garva-bhaṣitaḥ // (V. 23)

5 *Pāñcāla-deśam=ārabhya Mlecchād=dakṣiṇa-parvataḥ /*
Kāmboja-deśo Deveśi vāji-rāśi-parāyaṇaḥ // (V. 24)

6 *Hastināpuram=ārabhya Kurukṣetrāc=ca dakṣiṇe /*
Pāñcāla-pūrva bhāge tu Kurudeśaḥ prakīrtitaḥ // (V. 48)

In the first of the three passages, the Pāñcāla country is located to the west and north of Kurukṣetra and at thirty Yojanas (about 270 miles) from Indraprastha,[1] i.e., the Delhi region. Thus there is no doubt that this Pāñcāla lay to the north and west of Kurukṣetra and apparently also of Delhi while the ancient Pañcāla country lay not towards the west but towards the east of Delhi and Kurukṣetra.

The second passage shows that its author locates the Kāmboja country between Pāñcāla, as described by him and Mleccha, i.e., the land of the Musalmans, to the south-east of the latter. This Mleccha country is called Mahāmleccha in verse 28[2] of the same work, in which we are told that the Bālhīka country, i.e., Northern Afghanistan, lay to the east of Mahāmleccha and extended upto Kāmboja apparently on its eastern border. The ancient Kāmboja people being regarded as of Iranian origin, the discovery of the Aramaic versions of Aśoka's edicts at Kandahar (Afghanistan) in the west and Taxila (Pakistan) in the east has been taken to suggest the location of their land as including settlements in Southern and Eastern Afghanistan and Northern Pakistan.[3] This shows that the Pāñcāla country comprised at least parts of the Punjab in India and Pakistan.

In the third of our passages quoted above, we are told that the Kuru country, which is known from the *Mahābhārata* tradition to have had its capital at Hastināpura in the present Meerut District of Uttar Pradesh and a secondary capital at Indraprastha or modern

1 'Towards the north of Indraprastha' according to the variant reading.

2 Cf. *Kāmboja deśam=ārabhya Mahāmlecchāt tu pūrvake / Bālhīka-deśo Deveśi aśv-otpatti-parāyaṇaḥ //*

3 See Sircar, op. cit., pp. 194ff.

Delhi, lay to the east of Pāñcāla and to the south of Kurukṣetra between the Pāñcāla country and the Hastināpura region. While in the first passage, Pāñcāla has been located to the west and north of Kurukṣetra and the distance between Indraprastha and Pāñcāla is indicated, the third located the Kuru country of the Delhi Meerut region to the east of Pāñcāla and not to its west so that this Pāñcāla cannot be identified with the Bareilly-Farrukhabad region lying to the east of the Delhi-Meerut area. Thus Pāñcāla of the *Ṣaṭpañcāśaddeśavibhāga*, lying to the north and east of both Kurukṣetra and the Kuru country, lay in the present Punjab-Kashmir region, and there can be little doubt that its name is preserved in that of the Pīr Panjāl range called Pañcāla in the medieval works of Kashmir.[1]

The question now is when precisely the Bareilly-Farrukhabad area ceased to be called Pañcāla or Pāñcāla. On this question, R. S. Tripathi says "Rājaśekhara used the name Pañcāla for the country of which Kanauj was the capital, although from its omission by the Chinese pilgrim (i.e., Hiuen-tsang, 7th century A.D.) we may infer that it was not the popular designation of this kingdom at that time ;"[2] "Varāhamihira (6th century A.D.) includes the Pañcālas among the peoples of the Madhyadeśa, and reckons their country as one of the nine great kingdoms.[3] Presumably this list refers to much earlier times."[4]

Varāhamihira, however, gives us the following list of countries not really as 'great kingdoms' but as those whose kings were affected by the evil influence of

1 See Stein, *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. II, pp. 396-98.

2 *History of Kanauj*, p. 212.

3 *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, XIV. 32 ; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXII, p. 186.

4 Tripathi, op. cit., p. 213, note.

planets—(1) Pañcāla, (2) Magadha, (3) Kaliṅga, (4) Avanti, (5) Ānarta, (6) Sindhu, (7) Sauvīra, (8) Hārahaura, (9) Madra and (10) Kuṇinda. This may have been quoted from earlier astrologers; but Tripathi's argument that Pañcāla had already lost its popularity as the name of the Bareilly-Farrukhabad region as early as the 6th century A.D. when Varāhamihira flourished because the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang does not mention the country in the 7th century A.D. exhibits the fallacy of *argumentum ex silentio.* The pilgrim does not mention the Gauḍa country; but it does not prove that the name Gauḍa was not popular in his time and even in later times. It is well known that the celebrated monarch Śaśāṅka is mentioned by Hiuen Tsang as the king of Karṇasuvarṇa while Bāṇa mentions him as the lord of Gauḍa, Karṇasuvarṇa having been the capital of the Gauḍa kingdom during the age in question. The Gauḍa people are mentioned as an important power in epigraphic records of the sixth and seventh centuries such as the Haraha inscription[1] of Īśānavarman and the Dubi plates[2] of Bhāskaravarman as well as in numerous later records both epigraphic and literary. To mention a kingdom by the name of its capital is easily intelligible especially when the kingdom included other territories besides the original state around the capital city. When Hiuen-Tsang wrote, Kanauj was the capital of Harṣavardhana and Karṇasuvarṇa that of Śaśāṅka, both of whom ruled over dominions much bigger than Pañcāla and Gauḍa respectively, and that may have been one of the reasons why he preferred to represent the original Gauḍa country by the name of its capital.

---

1 *Ep. Ind.*. Vol. XIV, pp. 115ff.; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, pp. 385ff.

2 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, pp. 287ff.; Sircar, op. cit, Vol. II, pp. 1ff.

That the kingdom of the Āyudha dynasty having its capital at Kanauj was called Pañcāla is known not only from Rājaśekhara, who flourished about the first quarter of the tenth century A.D., but also from the Khalimpur plate[1] of king Dharmapāla (c. 775-810 A.D.) of Bengal and Bihar, who was a contemporary of the Āyudha kings.

Rājaśekhara's *Karpuramañjarī*[2] has a passage that says, "Sāgaradatta went to Kānyakubja, the capital of the illustrious Vajrāyudha, king of Pañcāla." This Vajrāyudha appears to have ruled at Kanauj sometime after the death of Yaśovarman in 753 A.D. and before 783 A.D. when the colophon of the Jain *Harivaṁśa Purāṇa* mentions king Indrāyudha who is known to have had his capital at Kanauj. Considering the question of the rule of Yaśovarman's successors at Kanauj and the shortness of the period, it seems probable that Vajrāyudha was the immediate predecessor (father ?) of Indrāyudha and the founder of Āyudha rule at Kanauj.

A well-known stanza of the Bhagalpur plate[3] of Nārāyaṇapāla says how Dharmapāla defeated Indrarāja (i.e., Indrāyudha) and other kings (i.e., Indrarāja's allies) and captured the royal fortune of Mahodaya

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IV, pp. 243ff. ; Sircar, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 63ff., verse 12.

2 Ed. M. Ghosh, p. 40 (Act III) ; ed. Konow and Lanman, pp. 74, 266—*Sāaradatto gado Pañcāl-āhivassa siri-Vajjāuhassa naaraṁ Kaṇṇaüjjaṁ ṇāma* (Sanskrit—*Sāgaradatto gataḥ Pañcāl-ādhipasya śrī-Vajrāyudhasya nagaraṁ Kānyakubjaṁ nāma*).

3 See A. K. Maitreya, *Gauḍalekhamālā*, p. 57 (verse 3)—

J tv=Endrarāja-prabhṛtīn=arātīn=
upārjitā yena Mahodaya-śrīḥ /
dattā punaḥ sā balin=ārthayitre
Cakrāyudhāy=ānati-vāmanāya //

(Kanauj), which he offered to the supplicant named Cakrāyudha. The Khalimpur plate of Dharmapāla, referred to above, speaks of the same episode in verse 12.[1] The second half of the stanza says how an unnamed person (known to be Cakrāyudha from the Bhagalpur plate), on whom golden pots were raised for pouring water at his own coronation ceremony by the jubilant elders of the Pañcāla country, was given the illustrious city of Kanyakubja by Dharmapāla merely by the sign of his gracefully moving creeper-like eyebrows. Here also the Āyudha kingdom having its capital at Kanauj has been indirectly mentioned as Pañcāla.

About 1030 A.D. Al Bīrūnī, who reads in Varāhamihira's list *Ananta* wrongly for *Ānarta* and correctly explains 'Avanti' for 'Ujjain', says, "Most of the names of the countries under which they appear in the context are not those by which they are now generally known."[2] If the name Pañcāla falls in this category, we have to think that it was losing its popularity during the days of the Gurjara-Pratihāras because, although they had their capital at Kanauj from the days of Nāgabhaṭa II (c. 800-33 A.D.), their empire extended over extensive areas of Northern India sometimes including Gujarat and Eastern Punjab in the west and North Bengal in the east. However, a later ruling family known to the contemporaries as 'the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kānyakubja' has left an inscription of about

1 Maitreya, op. cit., p. 14 ; Sircar, op. cit., p. 66.

2 *Bhojair = Matsyaiḥ sa-Madraiḥ Kuru-Yadu-Yavan-Avanti-Gandhāra-Kīrair =*

bhūpair = vyālola-mauli-praṇati-pariṇataiḥ sādhu saṅgīryamāṇaḥ /
hṛṣyat Pañcāla-vṛddh-oddhṛta-kanakamaya-sv-ābhiṣek-odakumbho
dattaḥ śrī Kanyakubjaḥ sa-lalita-calita-bhrū-latā-lakṣma yena //

the thirteenth century A.D. that speaks of Vodāmayūta (modern Budaun, Uttar Pradesh) as an ornament of the Pañcāla country.[1] Thus, the name of old Pañcāla was not forgotten even after the use of the name Pañcāla for the Pir Panjāl area was becoming popular and after the Muslim conquest of the Uttar Pradesh region.

The name of the city of Kanauj called Kānyakubja, Kanyākubja, Kanyakubja, Mahodaya, Gādhipura, Kauśa and Kuśasthala in Sanskrit works,[2] does not find mention in Vedic literature but occurs for the first time in works of the early centuries of the Christian era such as the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. However, the epics do not associate the rise of the city with the Pañcālas. The sage Kuśa, who was a son of the god Brahman, had four sons Kuśamba, Kuśanābha, Asūrtarajasa (Amūrtarajas) and Vasu who are said to have built respectively the cities of Kauśāmbī, Mahodayapura (Kanauj), Dharmāraṇya and Girivraja. Kuśanābha's daughters (*Kanyāḥ*) became hunchbacks (*kubja*) as the result of a curse, and this led to the name Kanyākubja (Kānyakubja or Kanyakubja) being applied to Mahodayapura. Kuśanābha's son was Gādhi from whom the name Gādhipura developed. Gādhi and his son Viśvāmitra are often represented as kings of Kanauj. The names Kauśa and Kuśasthala are derived from the name of Kuśa, father of the founder of the city.[3] The descendants of the sage Kuśa, who claimed to belong to the Kauśika-gotra, are not associated with the Pañcāla

1 Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 1670.

2 Sircar, *Geography and Cosmography in Early Indian Literature*, pp. 104, 107.

3 Cf. Vettam Mani, *Purāṇic Encyclopaedia*, p. 386.

clan. It seems that Kanauj was regarded as the capital of the Pañcāla country at a later date because of its situation in the region of Kampil, the old capital of South Pañcāla.

There is one question on which we are still in the dark. That is whether the Pīr Panjāl region has to be regarded as an old settlement of the Pañcālas.

CHAPTER TWO

THE THEORY OF TRIPARTITE STRUGGLE AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ĀYUDHAS

In a chapter entitled 'The Scramble for Kanauj and the Rise and Fall of the Pratihāra (Rājpūt) Empire' under the heading 'Mahodaya-śrī', H. C. Raychaudhuri says, "The tradition of empire attached to Kanauj from the days of Harṣa to the Muslim conquest. Rulers of the most distant corners of India counted it their proudest boast to have captured Mahodaya-śrī, i.e., the royal splendour of Kanauj. Bitter contests ensued for the possession of the imperial city."[1] The said contests are represented by Raychaudhuri as the 'Tripartite Struggle' among the Pālas of Bengal, the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan.[2] Elsewhere also the same scholar speaks of 'the warlike potentates beyond the limits of Madhyadeśa to whom the acquisition of the imperial seat of Harṣa was the goal of political ambition'.[3] The tripartite nature of the struggle has often been emphasised by various scholars including R. C. Majumdar,[4] H. C. Ray,[5] B. C. Sen[6] and others.

---

1 S N. Sen and H. C. Raychaudhuri, *The Groundwork of Indian Histoy*, 4th ed., 1935, p. 80. The chapters on early history in this work were written by Raychaudhuri.

2 Ibid., p. 82.

3 R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychaudhuri and K. K. Datta, *An Advanced History of India*, 3rd ed., p. 153. In this work also the chapters on early history were contributed by Raychaudhuri.

4 *History of Ancient Bengal*, 1971, p. 102.

5 *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, 1931, p. 285.

6 *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, 1942, p. 318.

It will be seen that there is more or less unanimity of views among historians that the struggle for supremacy in India during the eighth and ninth centuries A. D. was among three powers, viz., the Pālas, Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Pratihāras and that sometimes the aim of the struggle is supposed to have been the occupation of Kanauj which is believed to have attained a halo of imperialism like eighteenth-century Delhi the old capital of the Mughals and their predecessors. Unfortunately, we find it difficult to agree with the above two suggestions.

Those who speak of the struggle among three powers apparently ignore the Āyudhas of Kanauj no doubt because the kings of this dynasty are taken to have been petty chiefs. This idea probably emanates from the unimpressive position of Cakrāyudha who was a subordinate ally or feudatory of the Pāla emperor Dharmapāla according to the inscriptions of the Pālas and the Pratihāras. Thus the Bhagalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla and the Khalimpur plate of Dharmapāla say respectively that Dharmapāla obtained the royal fortune *(śrī*, i. e., *rāja-lakṣmī)* of Mahodaya (Kanauj) which he made over to the supplicant Cakrāyudha and that an unnamed person (no doubt Cakrāyudha) was given the city of Kānyakubja by Dharmapāla when the former was having his coronation celebrated by the elders of the Pañcāla kingdom. The same subordinate position is also indicated by the Gwalior inscription[1] of Bhoja which has a passage in the description of Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II (c. 800-33 A. D.) ; in the verse in

1 *ASI An. Rep.*, 1903-04, p. 281 (verse 9) ; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 235ff. ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins*, Vol. II, pp. 242ff.—

jitvā par-āśraya-kṛta-sphuṭa-nīca-bhāvaṁ

Cakrāyudhaṁ vinaya-namra-vapur=vyarājat.

question, the Pratihāra monarch is credited with a victory over the ruler named Cakrāyudha whose low position had been exhibited by his dependence on another person or on Nāgabhaṭa's enemies the reference here being no doubt to Dharmapāla. However, these statements regarding Cakrāyudha's relations with Dharmapāla can be justified even if Cakrāyudha was merely a subordinate ally and not really a feudatory of Dharmapāla. This is what seems to be suggested by the Sanjan copper plate grant[1] of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I (c. 814-78 A. D.) which has a passage in the description of the exploits of Amoghavarṣa's father Govinda III (c. 794-814 A.D.) ; according to this, when Govinda III was leading his expedition in the Uttar Pradesh region to the south of the Himalayas, Dharma (i e, Dharmapāla) and Cakrāyudha submitted to him at their own will In case Cakrāyudha was merely a feudatory of the Pāla king or was an insignificant chief, he was not expected to have been mentioned in the Sanjan plates along with the powerful king Dharmapāla. This appears to show that, although Cakrāyudha obtained the throne of the Pañcāla kingdom with its capital at Kanauj with the military assistance of the Pāla king, he was still regarded as the king of the important kingdom of Pañcāla. It seems that, on the death of the Āyudha king of Kanauj, possibly Vajrāyudha, there was a struggle for the throne between Indrāyudha and Cakrāyudha, who may have been brothers, and while Indrāyudha ascended the throne, Cakrāyudha applied for help to Dharmapāla and took shelter with him. This induced Dharmapāla to lead expeditions against Indrāyudha of Kanauj just as Pallava Narasiṁhavar-

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 235, verse 23—
svayam=ev=opanatau mahatas=tau Dharma-Cakrāyudhau.

man I led expeditions against Siṁhala for the installation of Mānavarman who had fled from that country in the course of a civil war for the throne of the land of Siṁhala.[1] It seems that the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Vatsarāja of Rajasthan fought against the Pāla king of the distant Bengal-Bihar region as an ally of king Indrāyudha of Kanauj, when the latter was attacked by Dharmapāla, just as the Later Gupta king Mahāsenagupta of Mālava (i.e., Eastern Malwa) fought against king Susthitavarman of distant Kāmarūpa at a place on the river Lauhitya (Brahmaputra) apparently as a friend of the Gauḍa king.[2] The defeat of Dharmapāla at the hands of Vatsarāja is known from a stanza found in the inscriptions[3] of Govinda III in the description of his father Dhruva; in this verse, we are told that Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva defeated Gurjara Pratihāra Vatsarāja who had previously acquired the royal fortune of the Gauḍa kingdom and not only drove the latter to the Maru (Marwar or the deserts of Rajasthan) but even captured from Vatsarāja the two white umbrellas of Gauḍa (i.e., the insignia of royalty of that country) which must have been obtained by him as a result of his victory over Dharmapāla.

---

1 See *The Classical Age*, ed R. C. Majumdar, p. 261.

2 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p 296, note 4. Cf *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol III, pp. 202ff.; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. II, p. 46, verse 14.

3 Cf, e.g, the Radhanpur plates (verse 8) in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, pp. 239ff.; also see *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XI, p. 157—

Helā-svīkṛta-Gauḍa-rājya-kamalā-mattaṁ praveśy=ācirād=
durmārgaṁ maru-madhyam=apratibalair=yo Vatsarājaṁ balaiḥ/
Gauḍīyaṁ śarad-indu-pāda-dhavalaṁ chatra-dvayaṁ kevalaṁ
tasmān=n=āhṛtaṁ tad-yaśo='pi kakubhāṁ prānte sthitaṁ
tat-kṣaṇāt//

When Vatsarāja was no longer in a position to be of any great help to Indrāyudha after the defeat he had sustained at Dhruva's hands, Dharmapāla may have repeated his attacks on Kanauj so that Indrāyudha seems now to have had to apply for help to the stronger arms of Dhruva, and this may be the reason why Dhruva claimed to have defeated the Gauḍa king (i.e., Dharmapāla) in the land between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, that was the Antarvedi territory in which Kanauj was situated. This defeat of Dharmapāla at the hands of Dhruva, who drove the Pāla king out of the Kanauj region, is mentioned in another stanza of the Sanjan plates.[1]

It further appears that, when Dhruva returned to the south, Dharmapāla renewed his attacks on Kanauj, and this time Dhruva's son Govinda III, who had already established his great might by defeating Vatsarāja's son Nāgabhaṭa II, came to the help of Indrāyudha, but that Dharmapāla and Cakrāyudha did not continue to fight the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch but pleased him by meeting him with presents very probably because Indrāyudha's throne was then already in the possession of Cakrāyudha backed by Dharmapāla and also because Indrāyudha was perhaps no more at the time. At the initial stage of the struggle, Dharma (Dharmapāla), king of Vaṅgāla, was defeated by Govinda III who took away the former's banner depicting Bhagavatī Tārā as we learn from the Nesarikā grant[2] of 805 A. D.

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 244, verse 14—
Gaṅgā-Yamunayor=madhye rājño Gauḍasya naśyataḥ/
lakṣmī-līl-āravindāni śveta-cchatrāṇi yo='harat//

2 Ibid., Vol. XXXIV, p. 137—
Tārāṁ Bhagavatīṁ khyātāṁ Dharmād=Vaṅgāla-bhūmipāt.

The above reconstruction of the story shows that, even if Cakrāyudha was a subordinate ally of Dharmapāla, there is no reason at least to believe that his predecessors, viz., Vajrāyudha and Indrāyudha, were not powerful kings. On the other hand, the story shows that Indrāyudha succeeded in maintaining his position against the onslaughts of Dharmapāla for a fairly long period of time first with the help of Vatsarāja and then with that of Dhruva. Indrāyudha possibly had no occasion to get any help from Vatsarāja's son Nāgabhaṭa II. When, however, Dharmapāla and Cakrāyudha made friends with Govinda III of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa house which was the enemy of the Pratihāra dynasty, Nāgabhaṭa II not only made an attempt, but succeeded, in driving out Cakrāyudha from Kanauj and even entering inside the Pāla empire as far as Mudgagiri (Monghyr) in the east, as we learn from the Barah plate[1] (836 A. D.) of Bhoja and the Jodhpur inscription[2] (837 A D.) of Bāuka. According to the first of the two records, which was issued from Kanauj, Nāgabhaṭa II approved of the grant of land in the Kālañjara-maṇḍala within the Kanyakubja-bhukti while, according to the second, Bāuka's father Kakka, who was apparently a feudatory

---

1 Ibid., Vol. XIX, pp. 15ff. ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. II, pp. 233ff.—*śrī-Kanyakubja-bhuktau śrī-Kālañjara-maṇḍal-āntaḥpāti-Udumbara-viṣaya sambaddha-Valāk-āgrahāre . para meśvara-śrī-Śarvavarmadeva-śāsanaṁ mahārāja-śrī-Nāgabhaṭadev-ānumatiñ=ca dṛṣṭvā bhogañ=ca mahārāja-śrī-Rāmabhadradeva-rājye vyavahāriṇo vaiguṇyāt kiñcit-kālaṁ vihataṁ jñātvā mayā ..Bhaṭṭa-Kācarasvāmy-anvayaja-brāhmaṇānām=antarā vicchedam=apramāṇīkṛtya prāg-bhāgakrameṇ=aiv=otsaṅkalita iti.*

2 *Ep. Ind*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 87ff. ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. II, pp. 236ff.—

Tato=pi śrī-yutaḥ Kakkaḥ putro jāto mahāmatiḥ/
yaśo Mudgagirau labdhaṁ yena Gauḍaiḥ samaṁ raṇe// .

of Nāgabhaṭa II, obtained fame in the struggle with the Gauḍas at Mudgagiri or Monghyr. Thus the Āyudha rule was extirpated from Kanauj by Nāgabhaṭa II who apparently transferred his capital from Bhillamāla (modern Bhinmal) near Jodhpur in Rajasthan to Kanauj whence the Barah plate was issued not long after his death in 833 A D. Under the two centuries of Gurjara-Pratihāra rule till 1019 A D., the city of Kanauj became one of the greatest centres of art, culture and commerce in the Indian sub-continent as we learn from works like Rājaśekhara's *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, etc.

That Indrāyudha was a powerful king, and not a petty chief is also indicated by the colophon of the Jain *Harivaṁśa*,[1] which offers very valuable information There is no difficulty about the first half of the stanza which mentions the date Śaka 705 (783 A.D.) when the work was completed at Vardhamānapura (modern Wadhwan in Kathiawar, Gujarat) and when the northern territory was being ruled by Indrāyudha and the southern land by king Kṛṣṇa's son Śrīvallabha (i.e., either Govinda II or Dhruva, both sons of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I, but probably the latter). The next half of the verse continues the list of kings who were ruling in the other directions, but can be differently interpreted. We may take it to mean that the east was being ruled by the king of Avanti and the west by Vatsarāja while Jayavarāha was ruling in Saura-maṇḍala, i.e., Saurāṣṭra or Kathiawar. It may also be understood as saying that the east was being ruled by the Avanti king Vatsarāja and the west by

1 See *JRAS*, 1909, p. 253 ; also *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XV, p. 141—
Śākeṣv=abda-śateṣu saptasu diśaṁ pañc-ottareṣ=uttarāṁ
pāt=Indrāyudha-nāmni Kṛṣṇa-nṛpaje Śrīvallabhe dakṣiṇām/
pūrvāṁ śrīmad-Avanti-bhubhṛti nṛpe Vats-ādi-rāje='parāṁ
Saurāṇām=adhimaṇḍale Jaya-yute vīre Varāhe='vati//

Jayavarāha flourishing in Surāṣṭra. Whatever interpretation we may accept, it is a significant fact that king Indrāyudha has been placed here on a par with mighty monarchs like Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda II or Dhruva and Gurjara Pratihāra Vatsarāja. Similar importance has of course been given also to Jayavarāha ; but that was no doubt because he was the local ruler in whose kingdom Vardhamānapura (the place where the Jain Harivaṁśa was composed) was situated. Moreover, Indrāyudha has been mentioned as the king of the north in relation to Gujarat. This suggests that his dominions extended considerably towards the west of Kanauj. Under these circumstances, he cannot by any means be regarded to have been a small king.

A word may be said about the difference in the interpretation of the *Harivaṁśa* verse to which reference has been made above As we shall see below, there is some evidence of the presence of the Gurjara-Pratihāras at Ujjayinī, capital of Avanti, about the middle of the eighth century A. D. However, it is difficult to believe that the Jain *Harivaṁśa* has mentioned Vatsarāja, who had his capital at Bhinmal in the Jodhpur area of Rajasthan, as the ruler of Avanti because, in that case, the Gurjara-Pratihāra king would have been ruling then over the territory extending from the Maru or Jodhpur region in the north to West Malwa in the east and his territory would have been lying to the north-west, north and east of the Gujarat region so that the reference to Indrāyudha's dominions in the north would become unnecessary because of its situation beyond Vatsarāja's kingdom. It is therefore better to think that Jinasena, the author of the Jain *Harivaṁśa*, really speaks of Vatsarāja as the king of the west and the king of Avanti, whoever he may have been, as the

ruler of the east as this would make it possible for him to locate Indrāyudha's kingdom in the north. Since Indrāyudha was essentially the ruler of Pañcāla, a territory in the central area of Uttar Pradesh, it is possible to attach some validity to Jinasena's statement if only the said king's dominions extended, about the year 783 A.D., to the eastern regions of the Punjab and Rajasthan in the west. In case his rule was confined to Pañcāla only, Jinasena could have hardly mentioned him in relation to Gujarat because Pañcāla is far towards the north-east beyond Avanti or West Malwa. This is probably an indication of the power and prestige of the Āyudhas of Kanauj, about which our knowledge is so meagre.

What has been said above would mean that it is a misnomer to call the struggle, supposed to be for supremacy, in the eighth and ninth centuries to be tripartite since that does an injustice to the contribution of the Āyudhas to the contest. It may of course be regarded as quadripartite because it was a struggle among the four powers, viz., the Āyudhas of Pañcāla, the Pālas of Gauḍa, the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Rajasthan and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan.

One of the most unwarranted suggestions in this context is R C. Majumdar's view regarding the identity of Indrarāja mentioned in the Bhagalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla. Because the name is given here as *Indrarāja* and not as *Indrāyudha*, no doubt owing to the exigencies of the metre, Majumdar is inclined to regard him as different from Indrāyudha and to identify him with Indra, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa governor of Lāṭa (South Gujarat) under Govinda III.[1] No other scholar has accepted this suggestion because it is

1 See Majumdar's monograph on the Gurjara-Pratihāras, *Journ. Dep. Let.*, Vol. X, p. 37, note 2; cf. his latest

unconvincing on the face of it. The language of the Bhagalpur plate is quite clear in saying that Dharmapāla obtained the Royal fortune of Mahodaya (Kanauj) after having defeated (i.e., as a result of his victory over) Indrarāja and other kings who were no doubt Indrarāja's allies and associates as we have already suggested. Moreover, according to a well-known practice of using the part of a name for the whole, recognised by the grammarians, a person named Devadatta could be called both Deva and Datta and a lady named Satyabhāmā both Satyā and Bhāmā.[1] Thus a ruler named Rāmacandra or Rāmabhadra is known to have been also called as Rāma and often as Rāmadeva or Rāmarāja meaning 'Rāma the king'.[2] Indrāyudha's name as Indrarāja is thus justified even in a passage in prose not to speak of a verse wherein the poet had to submit to the requirement of the metre according to the well-known dictum *api māṣaṁ maṣaṁ kuryāc=chando-bhaṅgaṁ tyajed=girām*. In this connection, we may note such other cases as the same king called Devagupta and Devarāja.[3]

---

recapitulation of the view in *History of Ancient Bengal*, 1971, pp. 175-76 (note 38).

1 Cf. Pāṇini's rule V. 3. 83 and the *Vārttikas* thereunder, particularly—*vin=āpi pratyayaṁ pūrv-ottara padayor=vā lopo vācyaḥ*.

2 See Monier-Williams, *Sans.-Eng. Dict.*, s. v. *Rāma* ; also the kings of that name in the Gurjara-Pratihāra and Yādava dynasties. Cf., e.g., *Ep. Ind*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 50ff.

3 See *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, pp. 281 (text line 7) and 436 (text line 7), 439 (text line 7) and 444 (text line 15).

CHAPTER THREE

THE GAUḌA-KĀNYAKUBJA STRUGGLE FROM THE SIXTH TO THE EIGHTH CENTURY A.D.

The next question we have to deal with is whether, in the eighth century A.D., Kanauj attained the halo of imperialism as Delhi enjoyed in the eighteenth century so that the biggest powers of the time contended to occupy it as has sometimes been suggested. Of course, Kanauj seems to have been the capital of the Maukharis in the sixth century A.D. This is not known from any definite evidence, but can probably be surmised on the basis of circumstancial evidence. The fact that, according to the testimony of the *Harṣacarita*[1] of Bāṇa, the enemies of the Maukharis attacked king Grahavarman who was killed and whose queen, the Puṣyabhūti princess Rājyaśrī, was imprisoned at Kanauj is one of the circumstancial evidences. The other is the transference of the capital of Harṣa's empire to Kanauj after he had succeeded in clearing the Maukhari territory from the invaders and in annexing it to his own old kingdom consisting of the *janapada* of Śrīkaṇṭha including the tract of Sthāṇvīśvara with the city of Sthāṇvīśvara (modern Thanesar) as its capital. It is very probable that Grahavarman's capital was invaded by his enemies who killed him and imprisoned his queen at the same place. Likewise, when Harṣa became the master of the Maukhari kingdom, covering wide areas of Uttar Pradesh occasionally with parts of Bihar, he seems to have transferred his capital from Thanesar, now about the western fringe of his expanded empire, to a new

1 See Cowell and Thomas, trans., p. 173.

place not only because it was more centrally situated but probably also because it had formerly been the Maukhari capital. However, it cannot be said that Kanauj had already acquired a halo of imperialism as the Maukhari capital. This is because the Maukharis were one of the many powers of Northern India that flourished during the post-Gupta period such as the Gauḍas, Puṣyabhūtis, Later Guptas and Bhauma-Narakas (i.e., the Kāmarupa kings) and also because their independent rule lasted only for about half a century. The reign of Harṣa, who ruled over much wider areas, at Kanauj lasted at best for about four decades while the equally important ruler Yaśovarman, who reigned for nearly three decades (c. 725-53 A.D.), began to rule about three quarters of a century after Harṣa's death. The Āyudha dynasty was founded, as we have seen, probably by Vajrāyudha sometime after the death of Yaśovarman. Thus Kanauj was not the capital of any kingdom or empire continuously for a long time and its position cannot be compared to that of Delhi which remained the capital of the Muslims from the beginning of the thirteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century. The struggle among powers during the eighth and ninth centuries therefore could have hardly centred round the city of Kanauj as has been asserted by Raychaudhuri. We have seen above that the importance of Kanauj began to rise greatly only after it had become the capital of the mighty Gurjara-Pratihāra kings who sometimes ruled the widest area of North India from the borders of Pakistan to those of Assam and enjoyed the position for two centuries.

If Kanauj of the eighth and ninth centuries A.D. could not have been a coveted imperial city like late medieval Delhi for inviting the invasions of various

powers, there must have been other causes underlying the struggle. For determining them, we have to discuss how the hostile relationship between the Pālas and Āyudhas was a legacy of the past struggle between the Gauḍas on the one hand and the Maukharis and other later rulers of Kanauj on the other, during the preceding periods.

The Gauḍa-Maukhari struggle began about the middle of the sixth century A.D. probably for the occupation of Bihar when both the Gauḍas and the Maukharis just succeeded in shaking off the Gupta yoke. It is first referred to in the Haraha inscription[1] of Maukhari Īśānavarman in a passage, in which the Maukhari king claims to have driven out the Gauḍa people from dry land and compelled them to make the sea their shelter. As we have suggested elsewhere,[2] this shows that the Gauḍas were a seafaring mercantile people and that this national characteristic of theirs is here attributed to their defeat at the hands of Īśānavarman in a well-known Indian poetical convention. We know how certain characteristic habits of the Turkish and South Indian peoples are attributed in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* to their defeat at the hands of the Kārkoṭa king Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa (eighth century)[3] while similar characteristic features of a number of foreign peoples are explained in the *Harivaṁśa* and the Purāṇas as the result of their defeat in the hands of the epic hero Sagara, the son of Bāhu and an ancestor of Rāma of the solar race of Ayodhyā.[4] The Turkish

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIV, p. 117—
kṛtvā c=āyati-mocita-sthala-bhuvo Gauḍān samudr-āśrayān.

2 *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 47-48 ; *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XI, 1945, p. 69, note 4.

3 See IV. 178ff. ; Sircar, op. cit., p 47.

4 See Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 41ff,

customs referred to were the shaving off of half of the head and walking with palms of hands joined behind their back at the time of marching, while, among Sagara's adversaries, the Śakas shaved off half their heads, the Yavanas (Greeks) and Kambojas (Iranian settlers) shaved off their entire heads, the Pāradas kept long hanging hair, the Pahlavas retained long beard, and the like.

That Bihar was a bone of contention between the Gauḍas and the Maukharis is indicated by the Deo-Baranark (former Shahabad District, Bihar) inscription[1] of Jīvitagupta II and the Rohtasgarh seal-matrix[2] of Śaśāṅka. The Deo-Baranark inscription speaks of the rule of Śarvavarman and Avantivarman, respectively the son and grandson of Īśānavarman, in the Gogra valley and also in the Deo-Baranark region, while the record of Śaśāṅka shows that he was ruling over the Rohtas region in the same area when he was stationed at the Rohtas fort as a *Mahāsāmanta*, i.e., a subordinate ruler, apparently under the Gauḍa king ruling from Karṇasuvarṇa at the time.

According to the *mitr-āmitra-cakra* (the circle of friends and foes of a king) conceived by the early Indian politicians, a king's neighbouring ruler is his potential enemy while the neighbour's neighbour is a potential friend.[3] This is exemplified by the friendship of the Gauḍas and the Later Guptas of East Malwa and their enmity with the Maukharis as well as the kings of Kāmarūpa. Although there is no direct proof of a friendship between the Maukharis and the

1 *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, pp. 215f. ; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. II, pp. 50ff.

2 *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, pp. 283-84.

3 See, e g., Manu, VII. 154ff., with commentaries thereon,

Kāmarūpa kings, an alliance between the two powers was inevitable because both of them were enemies of the Gauḍas That there was such an alliance between the Maukharis and the king of Kāmarūpa seems to be suggested by the fact that Bhāskaravarman (c. 600-50 A. D.) of Kāmarūpa made friends with Harṣa-vardhana as soon as the latter was approaching the erstwhile dominions of the Maukharis to fight with the enemies of his Maukhari relatives, particularly the Gauḍas since the Mālavas or Later Guptas had already been crushingly defeated by his elder brother Rājyavardhana and were being no more heard of thereafter for sometime.

The struggle between Gauḍa and Kanauj continued, and the Gauḍa king, possibly the son and successor of Śaśāṅka, was defeated by Harṣa and Bhāskara-varman and apparently became a subordinate ally of Harṣa. About 643 A. D. Harṣa is known from Hiuen-tsang's accounts to have been leading an expedition against Koṅgoda (Ganjam) in Orissa.[1] The reason underlying this expedition seems to be the subjugation of the Orissan rulers like the Śailodbhavas who had been feudatories of Śaśāṅka but were trying to throw off the Gauḍa yoke after his death and the defeat of his successor. Very probably Harṣa tried to subdue Orissa on behalf of the Gauḍa king who was then apparently his subordinate ally. Harṣa went to Orissa from Kajaṅgala near Rajmahal in the Santal Parganas District no doubt through the Gauḍa territory. Bhāskaravarman's part in the subjugation of the Gauḍa king is suggested by the issue of his Nidhanpur copper-plate grant from Karṇasuvarṇa which

1 Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, pp. 348-49 ; cf. Vol. II, p. 336 ; see R. S. Tripathi, *Hist. Kanauj*, pp. 127-28.

was then the capital of Gauḍa and lay near Berhampur in the Murshidabad District (West Bengal).

The struggle between Uttar Pradesh and Bengal-Bihar continued in the eighth century A. D. between Yaśovarman of Kanauj and the Gauḍa king, who was the lord of Magadha, as well as the Vaṅga king. Yaśovarman's court poet Vākapatirāja wrote the Prakrit poem *Gauḍavaha* in which his patron is represented as having killed in the battle the Gauḍa (i.e., the Gauḍa king) who was the lord of Magadha probably in addition to Gauḍa. The Kanauj king is also stated to have subdued the king of Vaṅga, who appears to have been an ally of the lord of Gauḍa-Magadha. The Nalanda inscription[1] of the son of a minister of Yaśovarman and the Ghosrava inscription[2] mentioning Yaśovarmapura as the early name of the said place in the Nalanda District of Bihar appear to associate Yaśovarman with Bihar while an inscription[3] from Pabna (Bangladesh), now preserved in the Dacca Museum, speaks of a courtier of Yaśovarman as the ancestor of a local ruler who was a feudatory of the Pāla king Devapāla (c. 812-50 A.D.).

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XX, pp 43f. ; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. II, pp. 229ff

2 A. K. Maitreya, *Gauḍalekhamālā*, pp. 45ff.

3 The incription was examined by me in the Dacca Museum in 1976 and was the subject of a note contributed by me to *Bangladesh Lalitkala* (in the press).

APPENDIX I

THE PROBLEM OF THE HARṢA ERA

1. Controversy about the Era

Formerly, it was generally believed that the beginning of an era was counted from the accession of king Harṣa or Harṣavardhana of the Puṣyabhūti dynasty in the year 606 A.D. This belief was, however, challenged sometime ago. The question therefore requires careful scrutiny before we come to the other question regarding its use in Bengal.

In the accounts of his Indian travels, the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen tsang records: "As soon as Śīlāditya (Harṣa or Harṣavardhana) became ruler, he got together a great army and set out to avenge his brother's murder and to reduce the neighbouring countries to subjection. Proceeding eastwards he invaded the states which had refused allegiance and waged incessant warfare until in six years he had fought the Five Indies. Then, having enlarged his territory, he increased his army bringing the elephant corps upto 60,000 and the cavalry to 100,000 and reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon."[1]

In connection with the above passage, Watters remarks, "We find two dates for the death of king Śīlāditya, Chinese history placing it in the year A.D. 648 and the *Life of Hiuen Tsiang* by Hwui Li in 655. Taking thirty-six years as the duration of his reign, we thus have 612 or 619 as the date of his accession. The latter date agrees with a Chinese statement that the troubles in India which led to Śīlāditya's reign

1 Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, p. 343.

took place in the reign of T'ang Kao Tsu (618 to 627 A.D.). But the date 648, or rather 647, is perhaps the correct one. It must have been 641 or 642, that, in conversation with our pilgrim as given in the *Life*, Śīlāditya stated that he had been sovereign for above thirty years. This also gives 612 for the year of his accession, and the addition of six years to the thirty gives 648 as the date of his death. But the Chinese envoy despatched in the early part of that year, found, on his arrival in the country, the king dead and a usurper on the throne. Moreover, it was in 648 that Yuan Chwang (i.e. Hiuen-tsang) submitted his records to T'ai Tsung, and Śīlāditya must have been dead before this work was drawn up in its present form."[1]

The statement of the *Life* that Harṣa Śīlāditya died in 655 A.D. and another Chinese statement that the king's reign followed some date in 618-27 A.D. have rightly been rejected by Watters although half-heartedly. But his supposition that Hiuen-tsang knew the date of Harṣa's death before submitting his *Records* to the Chinese emperor in 648 A.D. seems to be entirely unwarranted. It is impossible to think that anybody in China knew the date of Harṣa's death before the return of Wang Hiuen-tse's mission considerably after that event. At least there is no proof in support of such a conjecture. It is therefore more reasonable to think that the thirty-six years given by Hiuen-tsang as the duration of Harṣa's reign covers actually the period from his accession to 642 A.D. when the Chinese pilgrim was staying with him and not the period from his accession to his death. It seems therefore that, according to Hiuen-tsang's statements in question, Harṣa ascended the throne thirty-six years before 642 A.D., i.e., in 606 A.D.

1 Ibid., pp. 346-47.

The great Muslim savant Al Bīrūnī, who entered the north-western region of India in the train of Sultān Maḥmūd of Ghaznī in the early years of the eleventh century, says that an era of Harṣa "is used in Mathura and the country of Kanoj. Between Śrī-Harṣa (i.e. the Harṣa era) and Vikramāditya (i.e. the Vikrama era) there is an interval of 400 years, as I have been told by some of the inhabitants of that region. However, in the Kashmirian Calendar, I have read that Śrī-Harṣa (i.e. the Harṣa era) was 664 years later than Vikramāditya (i.e. the Vikrama era). In face of this discrepancy, I am in perfect uncertainty which to the present moment has not yet been cleared up by any trustworthy information."[1] The passage clearly says that Al Bīrūnī heard of one Harṣa era with its epoch 400 years before the start of the Vikrama era (i.e. in 457 B.C.) and of another Harṣa era having its epoch 664 years after the commencement of the Vikrama Saṁvat (i.e. in 606 A.D.). Nothing can possibly be made out of the fact, as has sometimes been attempted,[2] that Al Bīrūnī mentions only the Harṣa era of 457 B.C. and not the Harṣa era of 606 A.D. when he compares the epochs of the various Indian eras with the test year 400 of the era of Yazdajird.[3] This is because he had already referred to the two conflicting traditions regarding the epoch of the Harṣa era as well as to his doubts about them and apparently rejected, at least tentatively, the 606 A.D. tradition in favour of the 457 B.C. tradition regarding the beginning of the era. The passage quoted above cannot be regarded as vague, uncertain or ambiguous, and it unquestionably shows that Al Bīrūnī heard of a Harṣa era starting from 606 A.D., no doubt the year

1 Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, Vol. II, p. 5.

2 R. C. Majumdar in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 183 ff.

3 *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

of accession of an Indian monarch named Harṣa. Now the combined strength of the statements of Hiuen-tsang and Al Bīrūnī discussed above certainly supports the conclusion that king Harṣa, a contemporary of Cālukya Pulakeśin II (c. 610-42 A.D.) and the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang who travelled in India in 629-45 A.D., ascended the throne in 606 A.D. and that an era, which may have been called the Harṣa era, was counted from that date.

It may be argued[1] that the foundation of an era is not attributed to Harṣa either by Bāṇa or by Hiuen-tsang and that there was nobody to continue the regnal reckoning of Harṣa to let it develop into an era. As to the first part of the argument, it may be pointed out that, if Harṣa did not declare the foundation of an era by beat of drums and if his regnal reckoning, continued by his successors, developed into an era, as it seems to have been, there is hardly any question of Bāṇa and Hiuen-tsang mentioning the foundation of the Harṣa era. As regards the second part of the argument, it may be said that, if Harṣa did not leave any strong line of successors of his own family, his subordinates, who later became independent monarchs, could have continued his regnal reckoning to give it the character of an era. That such was actually the case is definitely suggested by the inscriptions of the so-called Later Guptas. There is no doubt that the Later Gupta prince Mādhavagupta, son of Mahāsenagupta, was a subordinate of Harṣa. This is not only suggested by the implication of the *Harṣacarita*[2] that the two brothers, the Mālava princes Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta (sons of Mahāsenagupta), took shelter at the Thanesar

1 Cf. Majumdar, loc. cit.

2 Cowell and Thomas, trans., pp. 119-21.

court during the rule of Harṣa's father Prabhākaravardhana (apparently after Mahāsenagupta's death when the throne of Mālava was usurped by Devagupta) and were allotted respectively to Princes Rājyavardhana and Harṣavardhana (sons of Prabhākara) but also by the passage 'with a desire of associating himself with Harṣadeva' in the description of Mādhavagupta in verse 18 of the damaged Aphsad inscription of his son Ādityasena, king of Magadha.[1] It is not impossible that Ādityasena, whose father was a subordinate of Harṣa but who himself later claimed imperial dignity,[2] began his life as a feudatory of Harṣa. Thus the use of the Harṣa era in the Shahpur inscription[3] of the year 66 falling in Ādityasena's reign is the most easily explained. Magadha formed a part of Harṣa's empire and was no doubt using the regnal reckoning of that monarch during his reign. The Shahpur inscription shows that the Later Gupta successors of Harṣa in that country continued to use the same reckoning at least for some years after the end of Harṣa's rule. We have also a large number of inscriptions indicating the continued use of the Harṣa era in the

---

1 *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 204—*Śrī-Harṣadeva-nija-saṁgama-vāñchayā*. The facts that Mahāsenagupta was a *Mālava-rāja* while his grandson Ādityasena flourished in Bihar with the title 'lord of Magadha' seems to suggest that Harṣa had placed his protégé Mādhavagupta over some parts of Bihar. See *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XI, 1945, pp. 69-74.

2 Cf. the following description of Ādityasena in the Deoghar temple inscription—

śāstā samudr-ānta-vasundharāyā
yaṣṭ=āśvamedh-ādya-mahākratūnām
(*Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 211).

3 Ibid, p. 210.

other regions of India, which once formed parts of the empire of Harṣavardhana.[1] It has sometimes been conjectured[2] that the Shahpur inscription is dated in the Nepal era (first used by Aṁśuvarman) because the daughter of Ādityasena's daughter (married to a Maukhari chief) was married to a king of Nepal. The suggestion, which is rather strange, seems to conflict with the imperial position claimed by Ādityasena and certainly looks absurd when we note that the Shahpur inscription is a private document and not an official Later Gupta charter. Of course, it may be conjectured that the private individual responsible for the Shahpur inscription came to South Bihar from Nepal and used the era prevalent in his home country. But we have no doubt that the suggestion regarding the use of the Harṣa era in the Shahpur inscription is far more easily explained. Moreover, scholars now believe that the Nepal era in question (that was first used in Nepal in the records of Aṁśuvarman about the beginning of the seventh century) started about Śaka 501 corresponding to 579-80 A.D.[3] so that years 66 of the said era would place Ādityasena in 645-46 A.D. when his father's overlord, Harṣa, himself was reigning.

According to the Nepalese *Vaṁśāvalīs*, "immediately before the accession of Aṁśuvarman, Vikramāditya came to the country (Nepal) and established his era there".[4] It has often been suggested that, by Vikramāditya, the chroniclers meant Harṣa Śīlāditya as, at this period, there was no

1 See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp 296-97 ; also below.
2 Cf. Majumdar, op. cit.
3 See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 271 (note 2), 297.
4 Tripathi, *Hist. Kanauj*, p. 94.

other Indian monarch, excepting Harṣa, who could have extended his sovereignty in Nepal. Indeed, we know that Harṣa Śīlāditya was sometimes confused with the traditional king Vikramāditya in Indian tradition, and we hear of a Harṣa Vikramāditya (for Śīlāditya) of Ujjayinī, probably because Harṣa was the founder of an era like the traditional originator of the Vikrama Saṁvat. We have to remember in this connection that the *Bhāvabodhinī*[1] of the seventeenth-century author Madhusūdana contains a passage wherein Harṣa is represented as the king of Mālava, as having his capital at Ujjayinī, as a leading poet and as the author of the drama entitled *Ratnāvalī*. That the confusion is much earlier than the seventeenth century is proved by Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*[2] which is composed about the middle of the twelfth century and says—

"At that time, there flourished, in the incomparable Ujjayinī, the glorious Vikramāditya, the emperor having the single parasol, whose other appellation was Harṣa."

"By annihilating the Śakas, he had made light the burden of the task of Viṣṇu who has to come down as an Avatāra for the extermination of the Mlecchas."

---

1 Cf. *Mālava-rājasy=Ojjayinī-rājadhānīkasya kavi-jana-mūrdhaṇyasya Ratnāvaly-ākhya-nāṭikā-karttur=mahārāja-śrī-Harṣasya* (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol II, pp. 127-28 ; R.S Tripathi, op. cit., p. 184).

2 *Raj. Tar.*, III, verses 125 and 128—
Tatr=ānehasy=Ujjayinyāṁ śrīmān=Harṣ-āpar-ābhidhaḥ /
ekacchatraś=cakravarttī Vikramāditya ity=abhūt // ..
Mlecch-occhedāya vasudhāṁ Harer=avatariṣyataḥ /
Śakān vināśya yen=āsau kārya-bhāro laghukṛtaḥ //

We have to consider also the stanza[1] that says: "Unhappy through its own factions, this realm (Kashmir), from that time onwards, was, for some time, enjoyed by Harṣa and other kings."

Thus Indian tradition seems to speak of Harṣa indirectly as the founder of an era exactly as the celebrated Vikramāditya. However, the attribution of Aṁśurvarman's era to Harṣa, if that was the intention of the *Vaṁśāvalīs*, has to be regarded as due to another confusion because we have Aṁśuvarman's records dated in the years 34, 39 and 45 while Hiuen-tsang mentions Aṁśuvarman as a past ruler in 637 A.D. so that he died long before the Harṣa year 45= 651 A.D.[2]

The only argument of any importance that has been offered against the attribution of Harṣa's accession to 606 A.D., which as we have seen, is supported by Al Bīrūnī and Hiuen-tsang's *Records*, is based on the *Life of Hiuen Tsiang* which is admittedly of lesser authenticity than the *Records*. But even in this case, the confusion regarding the evidence seems to have been due to misunderstanding. According to the *Life*,[3] Harṣa told Hiuen-tsang on the eve of of the religious assembly at Prayāga (Allahabad) about the beginning of 643 A.D. that he 'has been lord of India for thirty years and more' and further that he 'completed five of these assemblies', and was 'about to celebrate the sixth'. It has been claimed that, as the assembly was celebrated every five years, both the

1 *Raj. Tar.* II. 7—
Idaṁ sva bheda-vidhuraṁ Hars-ādīnāṁ dharābhujām /
kañcit kālam = abhad = bhojyaṁ tataḥ prabhṛti maṇḍalam //

2 See Sircar, *Ind. Ep*, p. 297.

3 Beal's translation, pp. 183-84. See below.

statements agree in placing Harṣa's accession thirty years before 643 A.D., i.e. about 612 or 613 A.D.

Unfortunately the above conclusion totally ignores the facts that, at his accession, neither was Harṣa a 'lord of India' (i. e. a *Cakravartin* or *Sārvabhauma* monarch or an emperor of wide areas of India)[1] nor did the Allahabad region, where Harṣa's conversation with the Chinese pilgrim is said to have taken place, form a part of his dominions. With the death of his elder brother, Rājyavardhana, only the small kingdom of Thanesar in Haryana came into Harṣa's possession. The dominions of the Maukharis covering the major part of Uttar Pradesh and some portions of Bihar were then under the occupation of the king of Mālava (Devagupta) and his ally Śaśāṅka of Gauḍa. The combined testimony of the *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa* and a damaged Nalanda seal suggests that Grahavarman had a younger brother whose name was probably Suvratavarman and that the latter may have been a partisan of his brother's enemies and was placed on the Maukhari throne by the Gauḍa and Mālava kings.[2] Harṣa came to free the dominions of his Maukhari relatives from the Mālava and Gauḍa enemies, which work may have taken him no less than six years as suggested by a statement of Hiuen-tsang quoted above. In any case, it was apparently impossible for Harṣa to declare himself lord of the Maukhari dominions at his accession as the act would have alienated the partisans of the late Maukhari king Grahavarman, killed by the Mālavas and the Gauḍas. That he formally declared himself lord of the erstwhile

1 For the conception of the *Cakravartin* and his *kṣetra*, see Sircar, *Stud. Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.*, 1971, pp. 1ff.; also *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. V, 1939, pp. 407ff.

2 Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. II, p. 215.

Maukhari dominions in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar a few years later seems also to be clear from the following statement of Hiuen-tsang's *Records*: "The Bodhisattva promised him secret help but warned him not to occupy the actual throne and not to use the title *Mahārāja*. Thereupon Harṣavardhana became king of Kanauj (i. e. the former Maukhari capital) with the title *Rājaputra* and the style *Śīlāditya*."[1] It is clear from this that Harṣa of Thanesar came to drive the Mālavas and Gauḍas out of the Maukhari dominions at first as a relative and ally of the late Maukhari king Grahavarman, but that he formally declared himself master of the Maukhari empire after having freed it completely from the Mālava and Gauḍa enemies. A confused statement of Hiuen-tsang (who seems wrongly to represent Harṣa's elder brother Rājyavardhana as a king of Kanauj) says that "the statesmen of Kanauj, on the advice of their leading man Bāni or Vāni, invited Harṣavardhana to become their sovereign" and that the prince at first 'modestly made excuses and seemed unwilling to comply with their request.'[2] This at least shows that the formal occupation of the Maukhari throne by Harṣa took place some time later than the date when he had become king of Thanesar after his brother's death. The formal annexation of the Maukhari empire and the attainment of imperial dignity by Harṣa appear to have followed his success against the Gauḍas in a protracted war lasting for about six years although the Mālavas had been crushingly defeated by his elder brother. Hiuen-tsang says that Harṣa 'waged incessant warfare until in six years he had fought the Five Indies (or had brought the Five Indies under allegiance)', that is to say that he

1 Watters, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 343.

2 Loc. cit. What Waters gives as Bāni or Vāni may be correctly *Bāṇin* or *Vāṇin*.

became 'an emperor' six years after his accession. As he got the throne of Thanesar in 606 A. D., he thus seems to have obtained imperial dignity in 612 A. D. This seems to be corroborated by the *Life* according to which Harṣa had ruled as 'lord of India', i. e. as an emperor, for over thirty years by 643 A. D. The first quinquennial assembly at Prayāga, the sixth of which took place about the beginning of 643 A. D, could have been celebrated only after Harṣa had become formally anointed as the lord of the erstwhile Maukhari realm covering Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, in which Prayāga was situated. As a king of the small kingdom of Thanesar in Haryana, he had nothing to do with the Allahabad region.

This seems to be supported by the damaged Nalanda seal[1] of a younger brother of Grahavarman, whose name may have been Suvrata or Suvratavarman, and he, as we have seen, was probably a partisan of Grahavarman's enemies and was raised to the throne of Kanauj by the latter after its occupation on the death of Grahavarman.

There is thus no evidence worth the name against the generally accepted view that Harṣa ascended the throne of Thanesar (not the throne of the Maukharis at Kanauj where he later transferred the capital of his empire about 612 A. D.) in 606 A. D. which was the commencement of an era named after him at least in later times.

However, the arguments set forth in the above lines invited comments[2] which require examination.

---

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIV, p. 285; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. II, pp. 215-16.

2 R. C. Majumdar in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 321ff.

In the first place, it was said, "Even if... Hiuen-tsang did not know of Harṣa's death when he submitted his records to the Chinese emperor, the only reasonable conclusion seems to be that he regarded Harṣa as still alive, and the thirty-six years, given by him as the duration of Harṣa's reign, therefore refer to the year 648 A. D. (when the records were submitted). When a man writes about the age of a friend who is presumed to be still alive, he naturally counts it upto the period of his writing, and not upto the day when they last met." But Hiuen-tsang was not writing 'about the age of a friend' and had hardly any reason to presume Harṣa 'to be still alive' or dead when he knew nothing on the point. Although the Chinese pilgrim has been accused of 'an aptitude for belief which has been called credulity' and is regarded as 'not a good observer, a careful investigator, or a satisfactory recorder',[1] it would be rather unnatural even for him to imagine Harṣa to be alive in 648 A. D., when he knew nothing about the king after the beginning of 643 A. D. A statement of Ching Po[2] shows that the *Si-yu-ki* or the record of the travels of Hiuen-tsang was the result of reducing 'to order the notes which he had written down'. The work was 'redacted' or 'compiled' probably with the help of Pien-chi who is supposed to 'have strung together Yuan Chwang's (Hiuen-tsang's) descriptions into a connected narrative'.[3] We are also told that "the first draft of this work was presented to the Emperor [of China] in 646, but the book as we have it now was not actually completed until 648."[4] Under the circumstances, it seems easier to believe that the

1 Watters, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 14-15.

2 Ibid., p. 17.

3 Ibid., p. 2.

4 Ibid., p. 12.

statement regarding Harṣa's warfare for six years and peaceful rule for thirty years was taken out right from Hiuen-tsang's notes on the point apparently 'written down' in 642-43 A. D. rather than that the duration noted down in 642-43 A. D. was first calculated to suit the year 646 A. D. and finally corrected to suit the year 648 A. D.

That calculations implied in the second alternative are even today not always resorted to can be illustrated by the fact that the *Vedic Age*, edited by R. C. Majumdar and published in 1951, places the separation of Burma from India 'ten years ago',[1] although the separation actually took place on the 1st of April, 1937, that is to say, fourteen years before the book was printed. It appears that the section was originally written in 1947 but that the date was not modified when the matter was sent to and seen through the press at later dates.

Let us take up for comparison another case of a similar nature. Minhājuddīn's *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* could not have been composed earlier than 1260 A. D.; but he had visited Lakhnautī or Gaur where he lived for two years between 1242 and 1245 A. D. During this period of his stay at Lakhnautī, he gathered certain items of information, later utilised in his work, about the rule of the Sena king Lakṣmaṇasena as well as of his descendants who, according to the *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, 'are still ruling in Bang (i. e. Vaṅga in South-Eastern Bengal)'. Now, there may be a difference of opinion as to whether Minhājuddīn means to say that the descendants of Lakṣmaṇasena were ruling in Bang till the time when he gathered the information about them in 1242-45 A. D. or when he wrote down

1 Op. cit., p. 76.

the *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* in or shortly after 1260 A. D. It is interesting to note that, in this case, R. C. Majumdar accepts the possibility of both the alternative interpretations. Thus he says that "Bang (i.e. Vaṅga or Eastern and Southern Bengal) was ruled by the descendants of Lakṣmaṇasena even when that work (i.e. Minhājuddīn's *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*) was composed" ;[1] but in a footnote to the above statement, he adds that Minhājuddīn 'visited Lakhnautī between 640 and 643 A. H. (1242-45 A. D.), and it is just possible that his statement about Lakṣmaṇasena's descendants ruling in Bengal refers to this period'. It will be seen that what is considered possible in the case of Minhājuddīn's *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī* cannot be regarded as impossible in connection with Hiuen-tsang's *Si-yu-ki.*

Secondly, it seems to us that we cannot be accused of rejecting the statement in the *Life of Hiuen-Tsiang* that Harṣa was lord of India for thirty years and more at the beginning of 643 A. D. On the other hand, we have suggested that 'lord of India' means a paramount ruler which Harṣa became after six years of warfare and not a smaller king which he had been at the beginning of his royal career. As a ruler of Haryana, Harṣa had in his army only '5000 elephants, a body of 2000 cavalry, and 50,000 foot-soldiers' ; but after six years, as an imperial ruler, he had an army consisting of '60,000 war elephants and 100,000 cavalry'.[2] Moreover, the *Si-yu-ki* clearly says that Harṣa ruled for sometime without assuming the title of king and

1 *Hist. Beng.*, Dacca University, Vol. I, p. 226.

2 Beal's *Si-yu-ki*, Vol. I, p. 213. Here is an interesting reference to the marked difference in the status of a king and an emperor. See Sircar, *The Emperor and the Subordinate Rulers*, Santiniketan, 1982.

ascending the throne with the title of 'Prince'[1] as we have already pointed out. The implication is that he assumed imperial dignity some (probably, six) years after the beginning of his rule. Thus the statement of the *Life* that, 'succeeding to the royal authority', Harṣa was 'Lord of India for thirty years and more' by the beginning of 643 A. D. may actually refer, as we have said, to the date of his assumption of imperial dignity six years after he had begun his rule.

Thirdly, as regards the statement of the *Life* that, by the beginning of 643 A. D., Harṣa completed five of the quinquennial assemblies at Prayāga (Allahabad) and was about to celebrate the sixth, we have pointed out that the first of these assemblies could have been celebrated only after the consolidation of his power over the Allahabad region of Uttar Pradesh, since as a ruler of Haryana, which he originally was, Harṣa had really nothing to do with Prayāga. However, our attention has been drawn to the fact that, according to Beal's translation, Śīlāditya held these assemblies 'after the example of his ancestors', and that this takes away the force of our argument. Unfortunately, it has not been explained how Harṣa's ancestors, who were rulers of Haryana, could have held the assemblies at Prayāga that lay in the Maukhari empire far away from the boundaries of their own territories On this point, P. C. Bagchi, the well-known Indian Sinologist, informed us as follows : "Beal's rendering 'after the example of his ancestors' is not justified. The Chinese words mean 'following the former institutions, or dynasties, or traditions'. It will do if we translate the passage as 'following the traditions' and in this context it would mean 'the traditions set up by princes of

1 Watters, op. cit., p. 343 ; Beal, loc. cit.

ancient times'. The context does not show in any way that the ancestors of Harṣa are meant here."[1]

Fourthly, it is true that Hiuen-tsang, even if he was not 'a satisfactory recorder', was a contemporary of Harṣa, while Al Bīrūnī, who was a great mathematician and astronomer and one of the greatest scientists of the ancient world, flourished four centuries later. But we should not have a hypercritical approach to Al Bīrūnī's evidence, because throughout his work this savant exhibits the well-known scrupulousness of a scientist; cf. his statements: "We ask God to pardon us for every statement of ours, which is not true;" "I for my part do not know what to say about these things, as I do not believe them," etc.[2] According to a well-known Indian tradition, Vikramāditya killed the Śaka king although the Śaka era (78 A. D.) starts 135 years after the commencement of the Vikrama era (58-57 B. C.). The Indians do not generally bother with such discrepancies; but Al Bīrūnī notes it and observes, "Since there is a long interval between the era which is called the era of Vikramāditya and the killing of Śaka, we think that Vikramāditya from whom the era got its name is not identical with that one who killed Śaka, but only a namesake of him." Therefore we should not ignore the fact that this savant merely heard of 'the Harṣa of 458 B. C.' from some of the inhabitants of Mathura and the country of Kanoj while he learnt about the 'Harṣa of 606 A. D.' from a perusal of the Kashmirian calendar which was, it should be remembered, an astronomical treatise. Before proceeding further, we shall reproduce the passage from Sachau's translation: "The Hindus believe regarding Śrī-Harṣa that he used to examine the soil in order to see what of hidden treasures was

1 See *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 74-75.

2 Cf. *Indo-Asian Culture*, Vol. I, p. 91.

in its interior..... His era is used in Mathura and the country of Kanoj. Between Śrī-Harṣa and Vikramāditya there is an interval of 400 years, as I have been told by some of the inhabitants of that region. However, in the Kashmirian calendar, I have read that Harṣa was 664 years later than Vikramāditya. In face of this discrepancy, I am in perfect uncertainty, which to the present moment has not yet been cleared up by any trustworthy information."[1]

What Al Bīrūnī learnt from certain persons of the Mathura-Kanoj region regarding the prevalence there of a Harṣa era commencing from 458-57 B. C. is undoubtedly wrong, as there is no evidence in favour of the existence of this era in any other source excepting this hearsay. We should also note that the Indians never used any era in dating their documents before the introduction of the so-called Vikrama Saṁvat of 58-57 B. C.[2] The persons from the Mathura-Kanoj area, whom Al Bīrūnī happened to meet, must have played a trick on the foreigner by giving this false information. A similar but more serious trick played on foreigners is known from the well-known story of the *Ezour-vedam.*[3]

While quoting Al Bīrūnī, we have written above: "between Śrī-Harṣa (i.e. the Harṣa era) and Vikramāditya (i.e. the Vikrama era) there is an interval of 400 years" and "Śrī-Harṣa (i. e. the Harṣa era) was 664 years later than Vikramāditya (i. e. the Vikrama era)" just to make Al Bīrūnī's sense clearer. It has, however, been pointed out, in respect of the inclusion

1 Op. cit, Vol. II, p. 5.

2 See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 235ff. ; cf. *Vikrama Volume*, ed. R. K. Mookerji, Ujjain, 1948, pp. 557ff.

3 Cf. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 13.

of '(i. e the Harṣa era)' after 'Śrī-Harṣa' in the second of the above two passages, that this is 'highly objectionable ... particularly as that is the very point at dispute', although no objection was raised about the insertion of similar explanatory words in regard to the three other cases of the two passages. But if 'between Śrī-Harṣa and Vikramāditya there is an interval of 400 years' means "between the Śrī-Harṣa era and the Vikramāditya era there is an interval of 400 years", as it certainly and unquestionably does, "Śrī-Harṣa was 664 years later than Vikramāditya" in the same author's language and in the same context must mean in our opinion, "the Śrī-Harṣa era was 664 years later than the Vikramāditya era." Unfortunately, it has been supposed that, although in the first passage 'Śrī-Harṣa' means 'the Śrī-Harṣa era', in the second passage the same expression indicates a king named Śrī-Harṣa. We are sorry that this interpretation does not appeal to our common sense. In the first place, a scientist like Al Bīrūnī could have hardly written : "king Śrī-Harṣa was 664 years later than king Vikramāditya", as the statement in that case would scarcely bear any sense. He could have of course said that the birth, accession or death of king Śrī-Harṣa was 664 years later than the birth, accession or death of king Vikramāditya ; but he does not say anything of the kind. In the circumstances, we are not prepared to attribute a meaningless and foolish statement to a scientist of Al Bīrūnī's standard. Secondly, the savant made the statement in question on the basis of information gathered by him from the Kashmirian calendar which was an astronomical work dealing with dates so that the mention of one or more eras is expected in it. It was not a story book, in which case the mention of kings could

have been expected. In what connection may a calendar mention two different kings and state rather foolishly that one of them was 664 years later than the other? There can be little doubt that Al Bīrūnī found in the Kashmirian almanac corresponding years both of the Vikrama era of 58-57 B. C. and the Harṣa era of 606 A. D., although he received a false report regarding the epoch of the Harṣa era from some people of the Mathura-Kanoj region. Apparently he put just a little more reliance on the false report because the era called the Harṣa era was then in actual use, as reported to him, in the area about Mathura and Kanoj. Thirdly, if Al Bīrūnī found in the Kashmirian calendar reference merely to a king named Śrī-Harṣa who flourished in 606 A. D. and not to an era commencing in 606 A. D., why does he speak of a 'discrepancy' in the information he gathered in regard to the epoch of the Harṣa era? He was certainly not such a fool as to think that, since there was a king named Śrī-Harṣa ruling in 458-57 B. C., there could not be another of the same name flourishing in 606 A. D. nearly eleven centuries later. It is clear therefore that Al Bīrūnī was 'in perfect uncertainty' about the epoch of the Harṣa era because he received two conflicting items of information in regard to the era, one from some people of Mathura and Kanoj and the other from the Kashmirian almanac. In our opinion, therefore, Al Bīrūnī certainly mentions the Harṣa era of 606 A. D. in the second of the two passages referred to above and this era must necessarily be attributed to king Harṣa of Kanoj, who was a contemporary of Hiuen-tsang travelling in India in 629-45 A. D. and Pulakeśin II ruling in 610-42 A. D. In the above circumstances, speculations regarding the date of Harṣa's accession on the basis of the

Si-yu-ki and the *Life of Hiuen Tsiang* appear to us to be quite useless, especially in view of the fact, as we have already shown, that whatever the two books say on this point is not irreconcilable with Al Bīrūnī's evidence.

Fifthly, in Magadha, Ādityasena was no doubt Harṣa's successor although he did not belong to the same dynasty, and he seems to have continued the use of the Harṣa era of 606 A.D. which was essentially the regnal reckoning of Harṣa and grew into an era owing to its use being continued by rulers of the succeeding age. There are numerous instances of such a case of local conservatism (note, e.g., the continuance of the reckoning of the Guptas by the Maitrakas of Valabhī after the fall of the former) ; but it is impossible to believe that Ādityasena, who was an imperial ruler, adopted the use of the era of the rulers of Nepal who had nothing to do with the region of South Bihar. Of course, the Shahpur inscription is a private record and shows that the people of Magadha were continuing the use of the Harṣa era during the reign of Ādityasena. It has been asked as to why Ādityasena did not clearly refer the year 66 of the Shahpur inscription to the Harṣa era if he wanted to give Harṣa's reckoning the character of an era. This question forgets that the Shahpur inscription is not an official record of Ādityasena, but is a private record. But even if it were an official record of Ādityasena, no student of epigraphy could have normally expected the mention of Harṣa's name in it. It is well known that, in the early years in the life of an era in ancient India, it was usually referred to as 'the year' exactly as in the case of a regnal reckoning.[1]

---

1 Sircar, *Ind. Ep.*, pp. 242ff.

Sixthly, in regard to the persistent confusion of Harṣa with the traditional Vikramāditya, to whom the establishment of the Vikrama Saṁvat is attributed, we suggested that it was probably due to Harṣa having founded an era. There has been an attempt to minimise the importance of this confusion; but we do not think that it is possible to ignore the Nepalese tradition, according to which Vikramāditya visited Nepal and introduced his era in that country sometime in the first half of the seventh century not to speak of the evidence of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and the *Bhāvabodhinī*, to which reference has been made above.

Seventhly, attention has been drawn to difference in the attitude of some of us in regard to the question of the Harṣa era and to the problem of the origin of the Vikrama Saṁvat, and it has been said, "the very suggestion of a king Vikramāditya having founded the era of 57 B.C. is an anathema to those who do not hesitate to defend stoutly the Harṣa era of 606 A.D."[1] It has been supposed that there is no reason to believe in the existence of the Harṣa era of 606 A.D. while there is some reason to accept the tradition regarding the foundation of the era of 58-57 B.C. by a king named Vikramāditya. We are very sorry that it is impossible to accept this proposition. While the Harṣa era is, in our opinion, quite clearly mentioned by Al Bīrūnī and is attributed by him to a date when a king named Harṣa actually flourished, it is impossible to believe in the existence of any ruler bearing a title ending in the word *āditya* (such as *Vikramāditya*) before the fourth century A.D. It is again impossible to believe in the story of the foundation of the Vikrama Saṁvat by

1 R. C. Majumdar, loc. cit.

Vikramāditya in view of the fact that the era was originally known by different names having nothing to do with Vikramāditya, with whom it was associated about a millennium after its foundation exactly as the Śaka era came to be associated falsely with another hero of Indian tradition and folklore, named Śālivāhana (Śātavāhana), in the thirteenth century A.D.[1] In connection with the foundation of the Vikrama Saṁvat, some people are ready to accept certain late and bogus traditions of no historical value at all, although, in the case of the Harṣa era, one is sometimes unwilling to accept the logical interpretation of a passage of Al Bīrūnī, a great scientist, which is based on a scientific treatise, the Kashmirian calendar, on the supposed strength of doubtful interpretations of passages in Hiuen-tsang's *Records* and his *Life* neither of which is remarkable for the exactitude of statements.

We are therefore inclined to emphasise the futility of the attempt to show that there are not sufficient grounds in favour of the views that Harṣa ascended the throne in 606 A D. and that he was the founder of an era, because we have good grounds in favour of both the suggestions. Moreover, as we have already noted and will see further below, the existence of the era of 606 A.D. is definitely established by its continuous use not only by Al Bīrūnī's evidence in respect of Kanoj, Mathura and Kashmir, but in numerous epigraphical records found in wide areas, over which Harṣa once ruled, for several centuries after his death in 647 A.D.

---

1 For the development of the Vikramāditya tradition, see Sircar, *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramaditya Tradition*, pp. 128ff., and H. C. Raychaudhuri, in *Vikrama Volume*, ed. R. K. Mookerji, pp. 483ff.

2. Spread of the Era and the Question of its Use in Gauḍa

We know that an early era was the regnal reckoning of an independent king (who was not bound to use the regnal date of his suzerain) continued by his successors, the years of the era being usually referred to just like regnal years and, for some time to come, without any specification.[1] It is also known that instead of the successors of an independent monarch, his erstwhile feudatories may have been responsible for the continued use of his regnal reckoning so as to let it develop into a regular era. Since Harṣa left no successor, the development of his era was due to the continued use of his regnal dating by the families of his former subordinates.

Harṣa's paternal kingdom comprised modern Haryana and the adjoining areas of Rajasthan and the Punjab, and he is known to have annexed Uttar Pradesh and Bihar to his dominions and also to have led successful expeditions against the Maitraka king of Valabhī in Gujarat and the Gauḍa king of Bengal and the latter's recalcitrant feudatories in Orissa. The subjugation of the Maitraka king, who married a daughter of Harṣa and became a subordinate ally of his father-in-law, suggests that the intervening regions of Malwa and Rajasthan must have owed allegiance to him. Therefore it is in the above regions that we expect records dated in the Harṣa era, and a large number of inscriptions are actually found in the land between Bihar in the east and Rajasthan and Punjab in the west, which are certainly dated in a reckoning that started in the first decade of the seventh century A.D. and can hardly be identified with regnal reckoning of any other ruler of territories covering wide areas of

1 Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, 1965, pp. 242-43.

Northern India, excepting king Harṣa who ascended the throne in the said epoch about the year 606 A.D. We may refer in this connection to the following epigraphs : 1. Kot (Bharatpur District, Rajasthan) inscription of year 48 ; 2. Dungarpur (Rajasthan) plates of Bhāvihita, year 48 ; 3. Shahpur (Patna District, Bihar) image inscription of the time of Ādityasena, year 66 ; 4. Dhulev (Udaipur District, Rajasthan) plate of Bhetti, year 73 ; 5. Dungarpur plates of Bābhaṭa, year 83 ; 6. Und (near Attock, Pakistan) inscription of year 158 ; 7. Tasai (Alwar District, Rajasthan) inscription of year 182 ; 8. Punjab inscription of year 184 ; 9 Kaman (Bharatpur District, Rajasthan) inscription bearing dates ranging between years 180 and 279 ; 10. Khandela (Jaipur District, Rajasthan) inscription of year 201 ; 11. Udaipur Museum inscription of year 207 ; 12. Khajuraho (Chhatarpur District, Madhya Pradesh) inscription of year 218 ; 13. Ahar (Bulandshar District, Uttar Pradesh) inscription containing dates ranging between years 258 and 298 ; 14. Kaman inscription of year 263 ; 15. Pehoa (Karnal District, Haryana) inscription of year 276 ; and 16. Pinjaur (Punjab) inscription of year 583.[1] The prevalence of the era in the Punjab till the twelfth century A.D. explains its appearance in the Kashmirian calendar of Al Bīrūnī's time.

It will be seen that there is no epigraphical record found in Bengal and Gujarat, which are generally believed to be dated in the Harṣa era. This may be explained by the supposition that the era was popularly used in areas directly under Harṣa's rule and not in the territories under his important

1 See Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, 1965, pp. 46-47 and references cited there.

subordinate allies. However, a lot of epigraphic records have been regarded as dated in the Harṣa era, wrongly in our opinion, in F. Kielhorn's and D. R. Bhandarkar's Lists of Inscriptions.

Thus Bhandarkar assigned a large number of inscriptions from Nepal (e. g., Nos. 1387-90, 1392, 1397-98 and 1400-02 of his List) to the Harṣa era. As we have seen, however, the Nepalese ruler Aṁśuvarman, whose records dated in the years 34, 39 and 45 would place his reign in 640-51 A.D. if the years are referred to the Harṣa era, was already a past ruler in the year 637 A.D. according to Hiuen-tsang so that the Nepal era started at least quarter of a century earlier than 606 A.D., probably in Śaka 501 = 579 A.D.[1] Likewise, the dates of the inscriptions of the Bhauma-Karas of Orissa (Nos. 1404, 1413, 1416 and 2042 44 of Bhandarkar's List) have been assigned by Bhandarkar (with slightly changed readings) to the Harṣa era ; but we now know that the Bhauma-Kara era started from 831 A.D. and not from 606 A.D.[2]

In the same way, the dates of the following inscriptions found in Bengal have been assigned to the Harṣa era in Bhandarkar's List—1. Ashrafpur (Dacca District, Bangladesh) plate of Devakhaḍga, year 73 (No. 1394) and 2. Tipperah (now Comilla District, Bangladesh) plate of Lokanātha, year 144 (No. 1399), while a note on the fictitious No. 1590 (Ashrafpur plate of Rājabhaṭa, son of Devakhaḍga) says that, although its date is given as the regnal year 13, R. C. Majumdar's reading of it as year 79 or 73 assignable to the Harṣa era 'is more probable'; cf. similar note on the real Ashrafpur plate of Devakhaḍga (No. 1394)

1 See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, p. 297.
2 Ibid., p. 302.

saying that the date read by R. C. Majumdar as year 73 or 79 may be 63, and it has been admitted, as regards Lokanātha's plate, that, of the letters giving the date, only *dhike catuścatvāriṁśat-saṁvatsare* can be read and Bhandarkar conjecturally restored the first word as [*śat-ā**]*dhike* so as to make it the Harṣa year 144 (i. e. 650 A. D.). These readings of the Ashrafpur and Tipperah (Comilla) plates are not, however, generally accepted. As regards the date of the Ashrafpur plate (read originally by G. M. Laskar as year 13 and later by D. C. Ganguly as year 7),[1] another copper-plate grant of the same king with similar contents is known to have been issued in his regnal year 13 (No. 1588), and our suspicion is that the other grant (No. 1394) from the same place bears the same date. With reference to the damaged date of Lokanātha's plate, the restoration proposed by us was [*triśat-ā**]*dhike* so that the year seems to be 344 of the Gupta era (i.e. 663-64 A.D.).[2]

Thus in our opinion, there is no evidence of the use of the era of Harṣa in the epigraphic records so far discovered in Bengal which does not therefore appear to have come under the direct rule of the Puṣyabhūti king as Bihar had been.

1 See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 225-26.

2 See *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIII, p. 224.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE GURJARA-PRATIHĀRAS AND THE PĀLAS

Our discussion above will show that the kings of Kanauj and Gauḍa, or roughly speaking Uttar Pradesh on the one hand and Bengal and Bihar on the other, were *prakṛty-amitra* or natural enemies and were fighting with each other from the middle of the sixth to the middle of the eighth century A. D., i. e., for about two centuries before the rise of the Pālas. If, therefore, the struggle was continued by the Pāla kings in the following centuries first against the Āyudha monarch Indrāyudha and then against the Gurjara-Pratihāras, it can hardly be regarded as due to the eagerness of the former to occupy the city of Kanauj for the imperial halo attached to it. We should also remember that the Gurjara-Pratihāras were old enemies of the Pālas since the time of Vatsarāja, that is to say, long before his son Nāgabhaṭa II (c 800-33 A. D) transferred his capital to Kanauj. The Pāla-Pratihāra struggle was therefore a continuation of an older enmity so that the halo of Kanauj, the later capital of the Gurjara-Pratihāras, could have hardly played any role of the subsequent struggle between the two powers. In the occupation of Kanauj, the capital of Indrāyudha, by the Pāla king Dharmapāla, nothing more need be read than something like the victorious presence of Bhāskaravarman at the city of Karṇasuvarṇa, the capital of his Gauḍa enemies who by then had been fighting with the Kāmarūpa kings at least from the time of Bhāskara's father Susthitavarman.[1]

1 Cf. P. N. Bhattacharya, *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī*, pp. 1ff.; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. 296.

A few words may be said here in respect of continuation of the struggle between the Pālas and the Gurjara-Pratihāras. We have seen above how a feudatory of Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II (c. 800-33 A. D., who was in occupation of the Kānyakubja territory and made the city of Kānyakubja his capital) claimed to have fought with the Gauḍas at Mudgagiri or Monghyr in Bihar. That suggests the temporary occupation of the Patna-Monghyr region of the Pāla empire by the enemies ; but whether this took place during the reign of Dharmapāla (c. 775-810 A. D), who was an older contemporary of Nāgabhaṭa II, or during the rule of Devapāla (c. 810-47 A. D.), son of Dharmapāla, cannot be satisfactorily determined. However, according to the Una copper-plate inscription of Avanīvarman II of Kathiawar (Gujarat), dated 899 A. D., his great-grandfather Bāhukadhavala, who was apparently another feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa II, defeated Dharma (i. e. Dharmapāla).[1] It may be noted that the Tibetan king Mu-tig Btsan-po (804-15 A. D.) claims to have subdued Dharmapāla while one of his successors named Ral-pa-can (c. 817-36 A. D.), who was a contemporary of Devapāla, boasts of his advance as far as Gaṅgāsāgara, i. e. the junction of the river Bhāgīrathī and the Bay of Bengal.[2] These successes of the Tibetans against the Pālas thus seem to have been events that took place during the close of Dharmapāla's reign and the beginning of the rule of Devapāla, and it is quite probable that the Tibetans were allied with the Gurjara-Pratihāras

1. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 7, verse 9—
Ajani tato='pi śrīmān Bāhukadhavalo mahānubhāvo yaḥ /
dharmam=avann=api nityaṁ raṇ-odyato=nīnaśad=
Dharmam //

2 R. C. Majumdar, *Hist. Anc. Beng.*, 1971, p. 118.

in their attack on the Pāla empire. That, however, Devapāla succeeded in driving out the Gurjara-Pratihāras from the western areas of Bihar is proved by the fact that he made grants of land in the Śrīnagara-bhukti (i.e., the province with its headquarters at Śrīnagara or Pāṭaliputra, i.e., Patna) and the Gayā-viṣaya (i.e., the district of Gaya) in the thirty-fifth year of his reign.[1] A recently discovered copper-plate grant[2] of Śūrapāla I (c. 847-60 A.D.), son of Devapāla, seems to suggest that Devapāla and his son were in occupation of the Varanasi District of Uttar Pradesh. According to this record, Queen Māhaṭā, the wife of Devapāla and the mother of Śūrapāla, built a temple at Vārāṇasī wherein she installed a Śivaliṅga entitled Māhaṭeśvara and placed its worship in the hands of a group of Śaiva teachers while, at her request, her son made a grant of four villages, two of them in favour of the god and two for the maintenance of the Śaiva ascetics. It is doubtful whether this would have been possible if Vārāṇasī was within the dominions of the hostile Gurjara-Pratihāras. Another fact of importance in this record is that one of the four gift villages is stated to have been situated in the Kalmaṣanāśapāra-viṣaya which was apparently a district lying on the outside bank of the Kalmaṣanāśa river that seems to be rightly identified with the present Karmanāśā flowing between the Patna and Varanasi Districts as well as between Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.[3] The name Kalmaṣanāśa means 'destroyer of sins' while Karmanāśā also means 'destroyer of [sinful] acts'. Moreover, *Kalmaṣa* may have been first corrupted

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 318ff. ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. II, pp. 71ff.

2 See *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. LXI, 1975, pp. 131ff.

3 Ibid., p. 207.

to *kalma* and then into *karma*. What is still more important in this connection is the discovery of an image inscription[1] of the time of Śūrapāla I at Sarnath that points to the inclusion of the Vārāṇasī region in the Pāla empire. All this indicates the success of the Pālas against the Gurjara-Pratihāras.

But the struggle was not over, and the said success of the Pālas did not last for a long time because, after a few decades about the close of the ninth century A.D., the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Mahendrapāla I (c. 885-908 A.D.), great-grandson of Nāgabhaṭa II, is known to have succeeded in occupying wide areas of Bihar and Bengal. We have a number of his inscriptions, dating from his second regnal year, in the Patna and Gaya Districts of Bihar while North Bengal has yielded two of his records dated respectively in the fifth and fifteenth years of his reign. Thus South Bihar and North Bengal were under Pratihāra occupation for more than a decade about the close of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century A.D. This is the most glorious epoch of the Gurjara-Pratihāras' history when Kanauj completed one full century as their capital.

During this period, the Pāla king Nārāyaṇapāla may have been ruling over a small part of his ancestors' empire either precariously or more probably as a subordinate of the Gurjara-Pratihāra emperor. He seems to have regained his position after Mahendrapāla's death when there was a civil war for the Gurjara-Pratihāra throne probably by siding with one of the claimants for the throne.[2] His re-occupation of the Patna region is indicated

1 *ASI An. Rep.*, 1907-08, p. 75.
2 Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 207-08.

by the Biharsharif image inscription dated in his fifty-fourth regnal year.[1]

Another significant fact is the occupation of the western part of Bengal, from the Dinajpur District in the north to Bay of Bengal in the south, by a people known as Kamboja, shortly after the end of Mahendrapāla's reign. We have a pillar inscription[2] of a 'lord of Gauḍa' belonging to the Kamboja race from Dinajpur while the Irda[3] and Kalanda[4] plates, discovered in the Balasore District of Orissa, speak of three Kamboja kings whose capital was at Priyaṅgu probably in the south-western border of Bengal. Linguisticians regard the name *Kamboja* to be the same as *Koc* or *Koṃc*, the name of a Tibeto-Mongoloid people of North Bengal and its neighbourhood.[5] It has been suggested by some historians that the Kambojas, who established a kingdom in Bengal in the tenth century A. D., came to this country in the train of the Tibetan invaders and represented the ancestors of the Koc, Mec and Paliya (also called Rājvaṁśī or Sūrajvaṁśī) peoples of North Bengal.[6] According to Pāla records, king Devapāla had to fight with the Kambojas while the Lucknow Museum plate of Śūrapāla I, referred to above, says that Devapāla had some success against the

1 See Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 1619.

2 Ibid., No. 1726.

3 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXII pp. 150ff. This grant was issued by Nayapāla, who was the son of Rājyapāla and the younger brother of Nārāyaṇapāla, in his thirteenth regnal year.

4 *Orissa Historical Research Journal*, Vols. XVI(4) XXII, pp. 111ff. The grant was issued in the king's fourteenth regnal year.

5 S. K. Chatterji, *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, pp. 329-30.

6 Cf. R. P. Chanda, *Gauḍarājamālā*, p. 37.

king of Nepāla, a country that acknowledged the suzerainty of Tibet at that time.

Kamboja Kuñjaraghaṭavarṣa seems to have established himself as the Gauḍa lord shortly after the death of Mahendrapāla I as about the same time the Kambojas are known to have besieged Devaparvata near Comilla not long before Trailokyacandra's invasion of the same city during the closing years of the first quarter of the tenth century A. D.[1] The Kambojas of Priyaṅgu probably flourished about the first half of the eleventh century A. D.[2]

1 *Abhinandanabhāratī* (K. K. Handiqui Vol.), Gauhati, 1982, p. 109.

2 Ibid., p. 110.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE GĀHAḌAVĀLAS AND THE PĀLAS AND SENAS

The struggle of Uttar Pradesh (if not Kanauj in particular) with Bengal and Bihar manifested itself in the eleventh century in Kalacuri Gāṅgeya (c. 1015-41 A.D) holding, from his base in the Vārāṇasī region, sway over Tīra-bhukti (North Bihar) in Vikrama 1076 (1019 A.D.),[1] the recovery of North Bihar by Mahīpāla I (c. 977-1027 A.D.) according to the evidence of his Imadpur (Muzaffarpur District, Bihar) image inscriptions dated in the regnal year 48 (c. 1024 A.D.)[2] and his occupation of Vārāṇasī indicated by the Sarnath inscription dated in Vikrama 1083 (1026 A.D.)[3] and his loss of Vārāṇasī to 'Gang' (Gāṅgeya) before 1034 A.D. according to the evidence of the Muslim author Baihaqui.[4] Gāṅgeya's son Karṇa (1041-72 A.D.) invaded Bihar during the reign of Mahīpāla's son Nayapāla (c. 1027-43 A.D.) according to Tibetan Buddhist tradition relating to the life of Atiśa Dīpaṅkara Śrījñāna[5] and was defeated not only in that area but also when he penetrated into the Birbhum District of West Bengal.[6] Yaśaḥkarṇa (c. 1072-1125 A.D.), son and successor of Karṇa,

1 *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XX, 1954, pp. 43ff.; cf. *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. XXIII, 1942, pp. 291ff.

2 *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXX, 1954, pp. 382ff.

3 A. K. Maitreya, *Gauḍalekhamālā*, pp. 107-08.

4 H. C. Ray, *Dyn. Hist. N. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 773.

5 See R. C. Majumdar, *Hist. Anc. Beng.*, p. 138.

6 See the Paikore pillar inscription of Karṇa (*ASI An. Rep.*, 1921-22, p. 115) and the Pāla inscription from Siyan (*Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. VI, pp. 40, 44; Sircar, *Śilālekh-tāmraśāsanādir Prasaṅga*, Calcutta, 1982, pp. 102ff.).

claims to have subdued Campāraṇya (Champaran in North Bihar).[1] This may, however, refer to the time of his grandfather Gāṅgeya.

During the twelfth century, the Maner plate[2] (1124 A.D.) of Govindacandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty of Vārāṇasī and Kanauj shows that he had advanced as far east as the Patna District where he was granting a piece of land near Patna while his Lar plate[3] (1146 A.D.) was issued from Mudgagiri or Monghyr. However, the Bihar (year 3),[4] Jaynagar (year 14)[5] and Valgudar (1161 A.D)[6] image inscriptions of Madanapāla (1143-61 A.D.) point to the recovery of the Patna and Monghyr Districts by the Pālas. The Rajghat (Varanasi) inscription[7] of Bhīmadeva, Madanapāla's minister for war and peace, points to the Pāla occupation of the Gāhaḍavāla city.

In the latest decades of the same century, the reign of *Gauḍeśvara* Lakṣmaṇasena (c. 1179-1206 A.D.) of the Sena dynasty, that succeeded the Pālas in Bengal and also in Bihar, witnessed success against the Gāhaḍavālas as indicated by the Sena claim of raising pillars of victory at Vārāṇasī and Prayāga (Allahabad) as found in a stanza occurring in the

---

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 11—
Campāraṇya-vidāraṇ-odgata yaśaḥ śubhr-āṁśunā bhāsayann=āśā-cakram=avakra-bhāva-hṛdayaḥ kṣmāpāla-cūḍāmaṇiḥ /
2 *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, Vol. XVIII, 1922, p. 81.
3 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 98.
4 Cunningham, *ASI Reports*, Vol. III, p. 124, No. 6.
5 Ibid., p. 125 ; *Journ. R As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. VII, 1941, p. 216.
6 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 145.
7 Ibid., Vol. XXXII, pp. 277f. ; Vol. XXXVII, pp. 245ff.

Madanapara, Edilpur and Madhyapara (Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad) plates[1]—

"By him were planted pillars commemorating military victory, along with lofty sacrificial posts, on the coast of the Southern Sea near the altar on which dwell the Club-holding (Balarāma) and Mace-bearing (Viṣṇu) gods (i.e. at Purī), at the site of Viśveśvara touched by the waves of the Gaṅgā, embraced by the Asi and Varaṇā rivers in trepidation (i.e. at Vārāṇasī), and on the banks of the Three Rivers (Triveṇī at Prayāga) truly sanctified by sacrifices performed by the Lotus-born (i.e. Brahman)."

The claim seems to have been made on behalf of Lakṣmaṇa's son Viśvarūpa (c. 1206-25 A.D.) though he could have fought with the Gāhaḍavālas only before the Turkish Muslim conquest of Bihar and West Bengal, i.e. during the reign of his father. Although Lakṣmaṇasena died in 1206 A.D., the western part of his dominions, i.e. Gauḍa comprising Rāḍha and Varendra, had been conquered by the Turkish Muslim leader Ikhtiyāruddīn Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār Khaljī on the 19th of the month of Ramazān in the Hijrī year 601 (i.e. May 10, 1205 A.D.). This is known from the gold Ṭaṅka issued by Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār in the name of Sultān Muizuddīn Muḥammad bin Sām in commemoration of *Gauḍa-vijaya* (the conquest of Gauḍa).[2]

---

1 *Ibid* Vol XXXIII, p. 316 ; N. G. Majumdar, *Ins. Beng.*, Vol. III, pp. 122 (verse 13), 135 (verse 12), 144 (verse 14)— *Velāyāṁ Dakṣiṇ-ābdher=Musaladhara-Gadāpāṇi-saṁvāsa-vedyāṁ Kṣetre Viśveśvarasya sphurad-Asi-Varaṇ-āśleṣa-Gaṅg-ormi-bhāji / tīr-otsaṅge Triveṇyāḥ Kamalabhava-makh-ārambha-nirvyāja-pūte yen=occair=yajña-yūpaiḥ saha samara-jaya-stambha-mālā nyadhāyi //*

2 See *Journ. Num. Soc. Ind.*, Vol. XXXV, 1975, pp. 197, 210, Plate XV, No. 1.

Lakṣmaṇasena's association with the western areas of Bihar is further indicated by the records of the Gaya region, which are dated in the *atīta-rājya* (or the past regnal reckoning) of king Lakṣmaṇasena. They show that the local people continued to use his regnal years in dating their records even after Sena rule had been ousted from the area, possibly by the Gāhaḍavālas or probably the Muslims.

Thus we have discussed above the following phases of the struggle between Kānyakubja and Gauḍa: (1) between the Maukharis and the Gauḍas, (2) between Harṣavardhana and Śaśāṅka, (3) between king Yaśovarman and the Gauḍa monarch (ruling also over Magadha), (4) between the Āyudhas and the Pālas, (5) between the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Pālas, particularly between Vatsarāja and Nāgabhaṭa II on the one hand and Dharmapāla on the other and between Pratihāra Mahendrapāla and the Pāla king Nārāyaṇapāla, (6) between the Gāhaḍavālas and the Pālas, and (7) between the Gāhaḍavālas and the Senas. To these we have also added the Kalacuri invasion of the Pāla empire through Vārāṇasī in Uttar Pradesh.

What has been said will make it clear that Dharmapāla's occupation of Kanauj is merely an occurrence pertaining to the long chain of events relating to the struggle between Uttar Pradesh and Bengal-Bihar that continued intermittently from the sixth to the twelfth century A.D. It has really little to do with any special position of Kanauj. Indeed it was regarded as a great city and an important centre of culture only decades after becoming the capital of the mighty monarchs of the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty. We should also remember that Dharmapāla cared neither to transfer his capital to Kanauj nor did he make it a secondary capital of his empire.

APPENDIX TWO

THE GURJARA-PRATIHĀRAS AND THE RĀṢṬRAKŪṬAS

Similar is the story of the struggle between the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and, as we shall see, it started about the middle of the eighth century A. D. when the powerful king Yaśovarman had his capital at Kanauj so that the fight between the Rajasthani and Deccanese powers could have really nothing to do with the said city at its beginning. As we shall see further, this struggle was also a legacy of the past because the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Pratihāras fought for supremacy in the lower valley of the Narmada in the eighth century A. D. exactly as the Cālukya king Pulakeśin II and the Puṣyabhūti monarch Harṣa did in the previous century.

The Sanjan copper-plate inscription[1] of Amoghavarṣa I has a stanza in the description of Dantidurga (c. 735-57 A. D.), founder of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire. It says that, when Dantidurga's subordinates arranged for the performance of a Hiraṇyagarbha-mahādāna ceremony at Ujjayinī, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king compelled the lord of the Gurjaras and other rulers (who may have been the latter's allies or subordinates) to act as *Pratihāras* or door-keepers. There is here a reference to a struggle between the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Gurjara-Pratihāra kings at Ujjayinī in West Malwa. Dantidurga's Gurjara-Pratihāra contemporary was Nāgabhaṭa I who was the founder of the imperial

1 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 235ff., verse 9 (p. 243)—
*Hiraṇyagarbhaṁ rājanyair=Ujjayanyāṁ yad=āsitam /
pratihārīkṛtaṁ yena Gūrjareś-ādi-rājakam //*

branch of the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty and has been identified with Nāgāvaloka, overlord of Cāhamāna Bhartṛvaḍḍha of the Hansot (Gujarat) inscription[1] of 756 A. D. The same struggle is also referred to in the damaged inscription[2] found in the Ellora Daśāvatāra cave and belonging to Dantidurga himself. In this record, we are told that something happened to the Gurjara-Pratihāra king's palace at Ujjayinī when Dantidurga was celebrating a Hiraṇyagarbha-mahādāna there. It will be seen that as early as the middle of the eighth century A. D., when the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Gurjara-Pratihāra empires were both just founded, the two powers confronted each other in the Malwa-Gujarat region, and became involved in fighting. That being the only area where the two empires met, we have evidence to show that the struggle between the two powers continued there for many years to come. It will be seen that, about the middle of the eighth century A. D., Ujjayinī in the Avanti country was a bone of contention between the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas though, after quarter of a century in 783 A. D. when the Jain *Harivaṁśa* was composed, Avanti or the Ujjayinī area was probably under the rule of a different dynasty as we have seen above.

We know that in the seventh century A.D., while the Maitraka king Dhruvasena II Bālāditya of Valabhī (near Bhavnagar in Kathiawar, Gujarat) was Harṣa's

---

1 Ibid., Vol. XII, pp. 197ff.; Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 20.

2 Cf. *dattaṁ yen=Ojjayanyām=api nṛpati-mahādānam=āścarya-bhūtam* and *saudhe='smin=kṛta-Gurjarendra-rucire* quoted by Altekar, *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times*, pp 34 (note 12) and 40 (note 33). See *Arch. Surv. W Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 87; Kielhorn's List of Southern Inscriptions, No. 71.

son-in-law and subordinate ally, the former's neighbours, the Lāṭas, Mālavas and Gūrjaras, were claimed to have been the feudatories of Pulakeśin II.[1] The Lāṭas had their capital at Navasārikā (modern Nausari in the Surat District, Gujarat) and the Gurjaras ruled from Nāndīpurī in the Broach District (Gujarat). There is some difficulty with the location of the Mālavas because there were more territories than one bearing their name in the same region. Bāṇa, who was a contemporary of Harṣa and Pulakeśin II, mentions the territories around Vidiśā and Ujjayinī respectively as Mālava and Avanti,[2] even though the name Mālava may have been also employed to indicate a wider area including the Avanti region.[3] Thus he associated the name Mālava

1 See the Aihole inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, pp. 1ff.), verse 22. According to the *Harṣacarita*, the said three peoples were enemies of Harṣa's father (Tripathi, *Hist. Kanauj*, pp. 78-79 and note).

2 See *Kādambarī*, ed. Siddhantavagisa, pp. 19 and 183; Sircar, *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramaditya Tradition*, p. 10. Cf. *majjan-Mālava-vilāsinī-kuca-taṭ-āsphālana-jarjarit-ormi-mālayā... Vetravatyā parigatā Vidiś-ābhidhānā nagarī rāja-dhāny=āsīt* and *Siprayā parikṣiptā vijit-āmara-loka-dyutir=Avantiṣ=Ūjjayinī nāma nagarī*. The same tradition is echoed in the *Jayamaṅgalā* commentary (13th century A.D.) on Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (VI. 5. 22 and 24). Cf. *Āvantikā Ujjayinī-deśa-bhavāḥ, tā ev=Āpara-Mālavyaḥ...Mālavya iti Pūrva-Mālava-bhavāḥ*. Avanti and Mālava are separately mentioned even in the late *Ṣaṭpañcāśaddeśavibhāga* (*Śaktisaṅgamatantra*), verses 17 and 21.

3 Cf. *yasyāḥ (Ujjayinyāḥ)...Mālavī mukha-kamala-kānti-lajjitasy=endoḥ kalaṅkam=iv=āpanayanto...* (*Kādambarī*, ed. Siddhanta-vagisa, p. 186). That the Ujjayinī region was sometimes included in Mālava about this age is proved by Uddyotana-sūri's *Kuvalayamālā* (779 A.D.) which locates Ujjayinī in the heart of the Avanti country and mentions Mālava as another name of Avanti or one of the two as included in the other. See Singhi Jain Series, No. 45, ed. A. N. Upadhye, p. 50.

particularly with East Malwa. On the other hand, Hiuen-tsang locates the Mo-la-p'o or Mālava country near the Mahī river in Gujarat.[1] It is possible that the Mālavas who submitted to Pulakeśin II lived in Hiuen-tsang's Mo-la-p'o because they appear to be mentioned in the Aihole inscription as neighbours of the Lāṭas and Gurjaras of Southern Gujarat. A similar type of territorial adjustment seems to have taken place also during the days of rivalry between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Gurjara-Pratihāras in the Gujarat region. There is a significant statement in the Baroda plates[2] of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa viceroy Kakka, nephew of Govinda III, that he was appointed the governor of the district of Lāṭeśvara (i.e., i e., Lāṭa) in order to ward off any possible Gurjara (i.e., i.e., Gurjara-Pratihāra) encroachment upon Mālava, and this Mālava is of course the Mālava of Hiuen-tsang and the Aihole inscription. Kakka was thus the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king's viceroy over both Lāṭa and Mālava in Gujarat.

In any case, the above discussion will show that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Gurjara-Pratihāras began to fight in the Gujarat region, from the very beginning

1 Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, pp. 242ff. For some other Mālavas, cf the land of the Malloi about the confluence of the Chinab and the Indus, the territory around Mālavanagara in the Uniyara Tahsil (Tonk District, Rajasthan) and the area around Dhuri near Patiala.

2 See *Ind. Ant.*, Vol XII, p. 160, lines 39-40—

Gauḍendra-Vaṅgapati-nirjaya-durvidagdha-
sad-Gurjareśvara-dig-argalatāṁ ca yasya /
nītvā bhujaṁ vihata-Mālava-rakṣaṇ-ārthaṁ
svāmī tath=ānyam=api rājya-phalāni bhuṅkte //

The Gurjara-Pratihāra monarch is represented here as the subduer of the Pāla king described as the lord of the Gauḍa and Vaṅga countries.

of their history, far away from Kanauj.[1] If, therefore, we find the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings Dhruva (c. 781-93 A. D.), who was a cousin of Dantidurga, and Govinda III (793-814 A. D.), who was Dhruva's son, fighting with their contemporary Gurjara-Pratihāra kings Vatsarāja (c. 775-800 A. D.) and the latter's son Nāgabhaṭa II (c. 800-33 A. D.), that should better be regarded as a continuation of the struggle started by their predecessors, viz., Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga and Gurjara-Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa I *alias* Nāgāvaloka. As we have suggested above, it seems that Vatsarāja fought with the Gauḍa king (Dharmapāla) as an ally of the Āyudha monarch Indrāyudha of Kanauj, but that, when Vatsarāja was defeated by Dhruva, Indrāyudha appealed to the stronger Rāṣṭrakūṭa power for help against the aggression of the Pāla monarch. Apparently the Gauḍa king's defeat at the hands of Dhruva did not dissuade him from leading vigorous attacks on Kanauj on the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king's return to the Deccan, and that seems to be the reason why Govinda III led an expedition in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā valley as we have seen. But as we also suggested, Indrāyudha may, by then, have been no more, and Cakrāyudha had already been placed on the Kanauj throne by Dharmapāla so that Govinda III seems to have accepted Cakrāyudha as king in place of Indrāyudha and the offer of submission (friendship ?) of the new king of Pañcāla as well as his friend and supporter, the king of Gauḍa. Whether the claim of the submission offered by these two rulers to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king was substantial or nominal and exaggerated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court poet cannot of course be determined in the present state of our

1 Cf. N. Venkataramanayya in *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Vol. VIII, p. 85.

information. It should be noted, however, that neither Dhruva nor Govinda III claimed to have occupied Kanauj so that the occupation of the Āyudha capital could hardly have been their goal.

The return of Govinda III to the Deccan did not witness the end of Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Pratihāra struggle. The vague claim of Amoghavarṣa I (c. 814-78 A. D.) of having been worshipped by peoples including the Vaṅgas and Aṅgas[1] may not be taken seriously; but Indra III (915-28 A D.), great-grandson of Amoghavarṣa I, is known to have led an expedition against Kanauj, the capital of his Gurjara-Pratihāra enemy, apparently Mahīpāla I (accession before 914 A. D.). The charters[2] of Govinda IV (830-33 A. D.) have a stanza in the description of his father Indra III. Here we are told, in the first half of the verse, that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, when he was marching against his enemy's capital, encamped with his elephant force in the compound of the temple of the god Kālapriya, which must have stood at modern Kalpi just to the south of the Yamunā in the Jalaum District of Uttar Pradesh, and then crossed the Yamunā. The second half of the verse says that the invader completely uprooted Mahodaya (Kanauj) so that people became used to call it *Kuśasthala* which was really another old name

1 Cf. *Vaṅg-Āṅga-Magadha-Mālava-Veṅg-īśair=arccito ='tiśaya-dhavalaḥ* in the Sirur (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, p. 213) and Nilgund (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 103) inscriptions.

2 See the Cambay plates, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, pp. 36ff. (p. 38; cf. Sircar, *Stud. Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.*, 1971, p. 305)—
Yan-mādyad-dvipa-danta-ghāta-viṣamaṁ Kālapriya-prāṅganaṁ
tīrṇā yat-turagair=agādha-Yamunā sindhu-pratispardhinī/
ten=edaṁ ca Mahoday-āri-nagaraṁ nirmūlam=unmūlitaṁ
nāmn=ādy=āpi janaiḥ Kuśasthalam=iti khyātiṁ parāṁ nīyate//

of Kanauj (after the sage Kuśa, according to epico-Purāṇic tradition) although the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court poet meant hyperbolically to say that the site of the devastated city became covered with *kuśa* grass and hence it obtained the said name meaning 'land under *kuśa* grass'. The claim is of course exaggerated because, if the city was so successfully destroyed, the Gurjara-Pratihāras could hardly have continued to rule from the same capital for a full century till 1019 A. D. when king Rājyapāla transferred his headquarters to Bari on the other side of the Ganges.[1]

It seems that the success of Indra III against the Gurjara-Pratihāra king is reflected in the claim of the former's feudatory, Cālukya Narasiṁha of Lemulavāḍa, to have chased Mahīpāla upto the junction of the Gaṅgā and the sea (i.e., Gaṅgāsāgara) as we find in the *Pampabhārata* (i.e., the *Vikramārjunavijaya* of Pampa) composed about 941 A. D. at the court of Narasiṁha's son Arikesarin.[2]

The claim of Govinda IV that his palace was served by the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā[3] may not be of great significance ; but Govinda's cousin, Kṛṣṇa III (939-68 A.D.), led another expedition against the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire. An inscription[4] of Kṛṣṇa III, discovered at Jura in the old Jaso State in Bundelkhand in the present Satna District of Madhya Pradesh, proves his presence in the Kālañjara-maṇḍala (i. e., the present Banda region) of the Kanyakubja-bhukti

1 Tripathi, op. cit., pp. 285, 287.
2 See *Pampabhārata*, ed. B. L. Rice in the Bibliotheca Carnatica, Bangalore, 1898, pp. 3-4.
3 See the Sangli plates, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, p. 249—
yad-anindita-rāja-mandiraṁ nanu Gaṅgā Yamunā ca sevate.
4 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 289ff.

within the dominions of the Gurjara-Pratihāras from the days of Nāgabhaṭa II as we have seen above.

It is interesting in this connection to note that Candella Yaśovarman (c. 940-52 A.D.), who was a contemporary of Kṛṣṇa III, is represented in the Khajuraho inscription of his son Dhaṅga (c. 952-1002 A D.) to have captured Kālañjar-ādri, i e., the impregnable hill fort of Kālañjara. The question is : from whom did he capture Kālañjara? It is usually supposed that it was from the Gurjara Pratihāras because the same inscription mentions the Gurjaras among the adversaries of the Candella king, their list including the Gauḍa, Khasa, Kośala, Kaśmīra, Mithila, Mālava, Cedi, Kuru and Gurjara.[2] If this is accepted, it may be conjectured that Yaśovarman succeeded in capturing the Gurjara-Pratihāra fort of Kālañjara with the assistance of Kṛṣṇa III. However, the fact that the same record mentions the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Vināyakapāla as the overlord of Dhaṅga, son of Yaśovarman, may suggest that the Gurjaras in the list of Yaśovarman's adversaries were not the imperial Gurjara-Pratihāras, but may have represented the branch line to which king Harirāja of a copper-plate grant[3] of 984 A.D., falling during the reign of Dhaṅga, belonged. But whether these Gurjaras were ruling over the Kālañjara area as vassals of the imperial branch cannot be determined without further evidence. It may be noted that, during this period, the power of

---

1 *Ep. Ind*, Vol. I, pp. 124ff. ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. II, pp. 258ff.

2 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 126 (verse 23) ; Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. II, p. 262, verse 23—
Gauḍa krīḍā-lat-āsis=tulita-khasa-balaḥ kośalaḥ Kośalānāṁ
naśyat-Kaśmīra-vīraḥ sithilita-Mithilaḥ kālavan=Mālavānām/
sīdat-sāvadya-Cediḥ Kuru-taruṣu marut=saṁjvaro Gurjarāṇāṁ
tasmāt=tasyāṁ sa jajñe nṛpa-kula tilakaḥ śrī-Yaśovarmarājaḥ//

3 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 30 ff.

the Gurjara-Pratihāras was declining since neither Harirāja's grant nor the later records of the Candellas refer to their overlord, and this may be due to the spread of Rāṣṭrakūṭa influence in the area for the time being.

As regards the northern expedition of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III, it seems that he also encamped at Kalpi while advancing against Bundelkhand. This is possibly suggested by the regard exhibited by him for the god Kālapriya by installing more than one deity of this name in different parts of his empire.[1]

1 See ibid., Vol. XXXV, p. 110.

Postscript

After the delivery of the present lectures in March 1983, I had occasion to see through the press my Bengali work on the early annals of Bengal, Vol. I (entitled *Pāl-pūrva Yuger Vaṁśānucarit*), Vol. II (*Pāl-Sen Yuger Vaṁśānucarit*) of which having been previously publihed in 1982. It may be pointed out that a few ideas expressed here may not exactly tally with their representation there. Thus, on the question of the Gauḍa peoples' association with the sea, the emphasis put here (p. 22) is their engagement in maritime trade while the other work tries to relate the particular characteristic further with the Vaṅga people's greatness in naval warfare. Indeed, the marine association of both the Vaṅgas and the Gauḍas, emphasised by their neighbours, appears to have been the basis on which the Bengalis developed finally as a national group.

Here the importance of the crushing defeat of Devagupta, the 'Later Gupta' king of Mālava (East Malwa), at the hands of the Puṣyabhūti monarch Rājyavardhana has been mentioned (pp. 24, 35) ; but the other work draws further attention to the occupation of Vaidiśa (Vidiśā), the capital of Mālava or East Malwa, by the Kalacuri king Buddharāja before the issue of his Vadner plate (Bhandarkar's List, No. 1207), from the said city in 608 A. D. very probably as an ally of the Maukhari king Grahavarman. Thus the Kalacuris and Maukharis were apparently friends because they were both enemies of the Mālavas (Later Guptas). It seems that Buddharāja was extirpated by the Maitraka king Dhruvasena II Bālāditya who was soon defeated by Harṣavardhana and became the latter's son-in-law and subordinate ally. The discovery of inscriptions dated in years of the Harṣa era of 606 A. D. suggests the inclusion of the Malwa-Rajasthan region within the realm under Harṣa's direct control (p. 48). It is not impossible that the Maitrakas were friends of the Later Guptas and enemies of the Kalacuris.

As regards the end of Buddhism in Bihar (p. 60), what Tāranātha says in his *History of Buddhism in India* is quite interesting even though the names of the four Sena kings are

given wrongly by the Tibetan author. We are told that, when the Senas were ruling, the number of Turkish Muslims increased and the Buddhist faith was destroyed in Magadha (Bihar). For checking them, the king made fortresses in the areas of Vikramaśīla-vihāra (about 25 miles to the east of Bhagalpur) and Odantapurī-vihāra (at Biharsharif near Nalanda) and established garrisons of armies there. A Turkish king named 'Candra' became the ruler of the Doab between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā. He sent Buddhist monks as his emissaries to the small rulers of Bhaṅgala (Vaṅgāla) and other lands for contracting alliances with them and destroyed the Magadha country. Thus the Odantapurī and Vikramaśīla monasteries were destroyed and the Buddhist faith was uprooted. A Muslim fortress began to flourish on the ruins of the Odantapurī monastery. Tāranātha's Sena chronology is indicated by the fact that the Kashmirian Buddhist scholar Śāntaśrībhadra (1127-1225 A. D.) appeared during the reign of the latest Sena monarch. It must be noted that 'Candra' (literally, 'the moon') cannot be the name of a Turkish Muslim king; but if the original Sanskrit expression was 'Turuṣka-candra' (really, 'the best of the Turuṣkas'), the name possibly becomes explainable. See Rigzin Luṇḍup Lāmā's Hindī trans., K.P.J. Institute, Patna, 1971, pp. 132 ff., cited by Sircar, *Pāl-parva Yuger Vaṁśānucarit*, p. 184.

There is another indication of the date of the destruction of Buddhism by the Musalmans. According to the *Śekaśubhodayā* and the *Pag-sam-zon-jaṅg*, the date of the Muslim occupation is Śaka 1124 (1202 A. D.). The Buddhists appear to have started a reckoning from the said year, which remained in circulation till recent times in the south-eastern fringe of Bengal where there is still a sizable Buddhist population. See Sircar, *Pāl-Sen Yuger Vaṁśānucarit*, pp. 176 ff. The story of the Muslim occupation of Eastern India can be reconstructed now as follows : subjugation of South Bihar by Ikhtiyāruddīn Muḥammad bin Bakhtiyār Khaljī completed in 1202 A. D. and Naodiyā occupied from there 'the following year' (1203 A. D.) ; issue of gold coins in the name of Muizuddīn Muḥammad bin Sām in commemoration of 'the conquest of Gauḍa' in 1205 A. D. and expedition led against Tibet in 1206 A. D. with disastrous results ultimately leading to his death. The earliest Muslim document from Bengal published in *Ep. Ind. A. P. Suppl.*, 1975, pp. 6 ff., is the Siyan (Birbhum District) Arabic inscription of the 7th Jumādā II, A. H. 618 (29th July, 1221 A. D.).

For the defeat of Dharmapāla in the hands of Vatsarāja (p. 13), we so long depended on the description of the exploits of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva (c. 781-93 A. D.) in the records of Govinda III. Now a recently discovered inscription of Vatsarāja himself, dated Śaka 717 (795 A. D.), shows how he defeated the Karṇāṭa, Lāṭa, Gauḍa, Mleccha and Kīra rulers as well as king Jayāpīḍa and the Tomara king Vyāghra. No doubt the Karṇāṭa king is Dhruva and the Gauḍa ruler Dharmapāla. The fact that the Gauḍa monarch is called *Cutur-udadi-pati* (i. e., lord of the four oceans or the Cakravartikṣetra bounded by the four oceans) points to his greatness admitted by the enemies. We are further told that Vatsarāja, assisted by his subordinates Śrīvarmaka and the latter's son Gallaka, regained mastery over Kānyakubja and re-enthroned Indrarāja there. It thus appears that Dharmapāla once occupied Kanauj by defeating Indrāyudha even before 795 A. D., i. e., during Dhruva's reign, though Vatsarāja succeeded then in re-occupying the city and re-installing Indrāyudha there. However, the claim of the Pāla records that Dharmapāla drove out Indrarāja from Mahodaya (Kanauj) and handed the city over to the new Pañcāla king Cakrāyudha and the statement of the Sanjan plates that kings Dharma (Dharmapāla) and Cakrāyudha submitted to Govinda III when the latter was leading an expedition in the Uttar Pradesh region about 800-02 A. D. would suggest that this refers to a second defeat of Indrāyudha in the hands of the Pāla monarch, the struggle between the two having apparently continued for many years. It should be remembered that, about the time of Govinda's northern expedition, the Gurjara-Pratihāra throne was occupied not by Vatsarāja, but by his son Nāgabhaṭa II.

The new inscription of Vatsarāja has been edited for *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XLI (in the press).

At the end, I am glad to acknowledge with thanks the co-operation I have received from the Society and the Press in the matter of printing the present volume and also the help from my former pupil Dr. Samareṣh Bandyopadhyay in preparing its Index.

31. 12. 1984.

INDEX

[co.=country, c. p.=copper-plate, Dist.=Districts, dy.=dynasty, ins.=inscription, peop.=people, etc.]

CORRIGENDA

Page	Line	Read
2	24	*Maitrāyaṇī for Maitrāyanī*
12	10	'copper-plate' *for* 'copper plate'
17	29	'north-west' *for* 'north west'
42	32	'op. cit.,' *for* 'op. cit,'
45	1	'*Hiuen-Tsiang*' *for* '*Hiuen Tsiang*'
49	14	'inscriptions' *for* 'inscription'
49	20	'inscriptions' *for* 'inscription'
52	30	'pp. 1 ff. ;' *for* 'pp. 1 ff.'
52	31	'*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. 29.' *for* '*Ep. Ind*, Vol. XXX, p. 29'
59	25	'*odgata-yaśaḥ*' *for* '*odgata yaśaḥ*'
59	30	*Journ. R As. Soc. Beng.*,' *for* '*Journ. R As. Soc. Beng.*,'
60	10	'i. e., at' *for* 'ie. at'
60	28	'Ibid., Vol. XXXIII' *for* 'Ibid, Vol. XXXIII'
63	8	'Gurjara-Pratihāra' *for* 'Gurjara-Pratilāra'
63	10	'mahādāna' *for* 'malādāna'
65	14	'i.-e., Lāṭa' *for* 'i. e., i. e., Laṭa'
65	15	'i. e., Lāṭa' *for* 'i. e., i. e., Lāṭa'